Vol. 2, No. 3 Fall 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITOR'S NOTE

Sir Francis Galton — TOQ Editor 3

ARTICLES

In Quest of Our Linguistic Ancestors:
The Elusive Origins of the Indo-Europeans — John V. Day 5

The Legacy of a European Traditionalist:
Julius Evola in Perspective — Guido Stucco 21

CLASSICS CORNER

Hereditary Talent and Character — Sir Francis Galton 45

BOOK REVIEWS

Henry Ford and the Jews and *The International Jew* — Reviewed by Kevin MacDonald 69

A Life of Sir Francis Galton — Reviewed by Gavan Tredoux 79

James Burnham and the Struggle for the World — Reviewed by Gil Caldwell 89

The New White Nationalism in America — Reviewed by Robert Griffin 97

Editors 103

Editorial Advisory Board 104

The Occidental Quarterly (ISSN 1539-3925), a journal of nationalist thought and opinion, is published by The Charles Martel Society four times annually in the Fall, Winter, Spring, and Summer. Unsolicited manuscripts from contributing authors should be submitted to the editorial department address: P.O. Box 695, Mt. Airy, MD 21771. Style sheets are available upon request. Subscriptions in the U.S. are $40 annually, $78 for two years, and $114 for three years; subscription rates for Canada $45 (first year), $88 (two years), and $129 (three years); European subscription rates: $60 (first year), $118 (two years) $174 (three years). All subscriptions including additional inquiries or subscription problems should be mailed to the subscription department: P.O. Box 3462 Augusta, GA 30914. Back issues are $10 per issue.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EDITOR'S NOTE

SIR FRANCIS GALTON IN PERSPECTIVE

The legacy of Sir Francis Galton—an industrious inventor, explorer, statistician, hereditarian pioneer, and founder of eugenics—is one that properly deserves further reflection and greater appreciation. Our second in an occasional feature titled *The Classics' Corner*, offers to *TOQ* readers Galton's influential two-part article, "Hereditary Talent and Character,"which originally appeared in *Macmillan's magazine* in 1865. The often cited piece formed the basis of his of 1869 book *Hereditary Genius*.

In fact, much of what is taken for granted in behavioral science research, a substantially refined understanding of the *interaction of nature and nurtue* in human behavioral development, stems from Galton's visionary insights. As with most geniuses, Galton was far ahead of his time in proposing the study of twins as a research tool for identifying the impact of inherited traits. His work is just beginning to receive the appreciation it justly merits. In the second edition of their textbook, *Behavioral Genetics: A Primer*, authors Robert Plomin, John C. DeFries, and Gerald E. McClearn summarize Galton's early influence upon the field, noting,

> But it was Galton who championed the idea of the inheritance of behavior and vigorously consolidated and extended it. In effect, we may regard Galton's efforts as the beginning of behavioral genetics.[1]

In his 1998 tome *The g Factor*, the distinguished psychologist Arthur R. Jensen summarizes Galton's career and pioneering role in the history of the behavioral sciences. Jensen recognizes Galton as "one of the two founding fathers of empirical psychology, along with Wilhelm Wundt (1832-1920), who established the first laboratory of experimental psychology in 1879 in leipzig."[2]

Perhaps Galton's most important contribution to the *survival* of Western civilization was his enthusiastic dedication to developing the science of eugenics. For Galton, the effort to "improve the inborn qualities of a race" was paramount. Everything else depended on it. Advanced and evolving societies required men and women of sound stock, exceptional character, and remarkable talent to cultivate the best physical, cultural, and mental qualities of any race. Civilized societies that failed to grasp this essential fact mortgaged their future with a dysgenic decline in racial qualities.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Galton noticed a phenomenon he referred to as the regression to the mean, which he elaborated in terms of character traits in his 1883 book, *Inquiries into Human Faculty*,

> The fact of an individual being naturally gifted with high qualities, may be due either to his being an exceptionally good specimen of a poor race, or an average specimen of a high one. The difference of origin would betray itself in his descendants; they would revert towards the typical center of their race, deteriorating in the first case but not in the second. The two cases, though theoretically distinct, are confused in reality, owing to the frequency with which exceptional personal qualities connote the departure of the entire nature of the individual from his ancestral type, and the formation of a new strain having its own typical center. It is hardly necessary to add that it is in this indirect way that natural selection improves a race. The two events of selection and difference of race ought, however, to be carefully distinguished in broad practical considerations, while the frequency of their concurrence is born in mind and allowed for.
>
> So long at the race remains radically the same, the stringent selection of the best specimens to rear and breed from, can never lead to any permanent result. The attempt to raise the standard of such a race is like the labor of Sisyphus in rolling his stone uphill; let the effort be relaxed for a moment, and the stone will roll back . . . Whenever a low race is preserved under conditions of life that exact a high level of efficiency, it must be subjected to rigorous selection.[3]

Galton's grasp of the significance of individual and racial differences across human traits of character, intellect, and temperament, exceeded many of his contemporaries and remains, in certain quarters of society, lost on elites who cling to the "blank slate" concept of human nature. Galton's impact serves as a lesson for Western nations, namely that one individual can profoundly influence the course of history, particularly the future course of an advanced civilization.

Gavan Tredoux's excellent review in this issue of Nicholas Wright Gillham's biography *A Life of Sir Francis Galton* puts Galton's life into perspective, weighing the achievements of an exemplary individual who exhibited an unusual curiosity, drive, and intelligence to contemplate the means of improving the future of the race.

End Notes

1. Robert Plomin, John C. Defries, and Gerald E. McClearn *Behavioral Genetics: A Primer*, second edition, New York: W. H. Freeman and Co., 1990, p. 29.

2. Arthur R. Jensen *The g Factor: The Science of Mental Ability*, Westport, Conn: Praeger, 1998, p. 9.

3. Francis Galton *Inquiries Into Human Faculty and Its Development*, second edition, London: J. M. Dent Ltd., 1928, pp. 198-199.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In Quest of Our Linguistic Ancestors
The Elusive Origins of the Indo-Europeans

John V. Day

The Proto-Indo-Europeans, they say, were the herdsmen who changed the world. But these days even the majority of well-educated people in the West have never even heard of them. They might tell you that the Aryans, who were Proto-Indo-Europeans under another name, had some connection with Adolf Hitler, but this information stretches their knowledge to the limit. This widespread ignorance among Westerners is cause for great shame, but it should be expected. For decades, educators in schools and universities have neglected Proto-Indo-Europeans. And although several scholars in recent years have written general books about them, readers seldom come across these works in bookshops.[1] Non-readers never have the chance to learn about Proto-Indo-Europeans, either. It appears that neither the TV companies nor Hollywood have made a single documentary or movie on the subject. And yet, as the history of the world turned out, these Proto-Indo-Europeans may have been the most important people who ever lived.

Now, this is not Erich von Däniken's "Chariots of the Gods" or some other fanciful idea dreamed up by the unhinged or those wanting to sell mountains of books for a quick buck, although it must be admitted that over the years one or two misguided souls have tried to locate Proto-Indo-Europeans in such unlikely places as Tibet, the Sahara, Antarctica, and outer space. The real story of the Proto-Indo-Europeans has been pieced together from meticulous work by brilliant linguists, mythologists, archaeologists, and anthropologists over the last two hundred years.

Scholarship understands a lot about Proto-Indo-Europeans, and yet they are still the most elusive of peoples. For one thing, nobody can pin down precisely where they lived—or even precisely when they lived, although it must have been at least four or five thousand years ago. Nobody knows what they called themselves or what their neighbors called them. "Proto-Indo-Europeans" is our modern term. None of the Proto-Indo-Europeans' literate neighbors recorded what they looked like or which customs they practiced. And we have no documents, not even a single word, written by the Proto-Indo-Europeans themselves. In all probability, they had no writing.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LANGUAGE OF THE PROTO-INDO-EUROPEANS

Yet scholars have identified the Proto-Indo-Europeans mainly by their spoken language. This language may not have been written down, but as groups of Proto-Indo-Europeans spread further afield in antiquity and lost contact with each other, so their original language diversified into daughter languages, and linguists can reconstruct a good deal of Proto-Indo-European from these daughter languages that "were" preserved in texts.

Consider, for example, some words in ancient languages that mean *mother*.[2] The word mother in ancient Greek was *meter*, in Latin it was *mater*, and in Sanskrit, a language spoken in northern India over 3,000 years ago, it was *matar*. All these words correspond so well that linguists can reconstruct from them the original Proto-Indo-European form for mother as *mater*. (The modern English word *mother*, incidentally, derives from Proto-Indo-European via another route altogether, from its Germanic branch in ancient northern Europe.) Similarly, linguists can compare Greek *nephos*, Latin *nebula* and Sanskrit *nabhas*--all words meaning mist, fog or cloud—to obtain the Proto-Indo-European form for cloud. These words indicate only that Proto-Indo-European people recognized their mothers and experienced cloudy days. But linguists can go much further. Among the hundreds of Proto-Indo-European words that have been reconstructed are the numbers one to ten; the other family members of father, brother and sister; the body parts of eye, ear, nose and mouth; such trees as ash, birch, pine and willow; and such domestic animals as cow, sheep, goat and pig. Proto-Indo-European vocabulary was so precise, linguists tell us, that it even distinguished between words for breaking wind audibly and inaudibly.[3]

Furthermore, the parts of grammar that survive in Proto-Indo-European's daughter languages closely resemble one another. Pupils who study Latin often begin by learning *amo*, *amas*, *amat*— I love, you love, he loves. These verb endings of *-o*, *-as,* and *-at* find parallels in other languages, such as the comparable verb endings in modern German of *-e*, *-st,* and *-t*.

Linguists use a similar comparative method to determine that Proto-Indo-Europeans sorted nouns by gender (masculine, feminine, or neuter) and number (singular, plural, or dual [for two of a kind]). Each noun, moreover, had eight cases, depending on its purpose in a sentence, and each one had a different ending. Thus every Proto-Indo-European who opened his mouth to speak a few words realized that a noun like mother or cloud had 72 possible endings to choose from. Proto-Indo-Europeans may not have used writing, which was being invented by their contemporaries in the highly centralized economies of Egypt and Mesopotamia to count goods and register taxes, but they evidently did not suffer from low IQs.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The daughter languages of Proto-Indo-European can be grouped into such branches as Celtic, Greek, and Germanic, so that in the modern world English, Dutch, and German languages, for example, all belong in the Germanic branch. We know from ancient written texts that Indo-European languages—the languages that the original Proto-Indo-European developed into—have for thousands of years covered much of Europe and Asia.

During this period, Celtic languages were spoken across vast regions from central Europe to Iberia. Consider the linguistic map of Europe and Asia during the 1st millennium B.C., the period in which some of the earliest evidence for the location of early Indo-European languages appears.[4] Across northern Europe, running from west to east, were Germanic, Baltic, and Slavic branches, while the so-called "Iranian" branch was spoken on the steppe before moving southward into Iran itself. In Italy existed the Italic branch, its best-known member being Latin, and further east in ancient Europe there were Thracian, Illyrian, Greek, and Albanian branches. During early historical times, the Armenian branch was sited in Asia's far southwest and the Indic branch in south central Asia. Languages descended from all these Indo-European branches of Europe and Asia survive today. But some other branches have died out, such as the Anatolian and Phrygian in Anatolia (which is what prehistorians call Turkey) and the Tocharian in northwest China.

As noted above, this particular survey of Indo-European languages dates to roughly the first millennium B.C. Any such map can have only a rough date, because, for a variety of reasons, the extent of languages will change over time. For example, Celtic used to be spoken over much of western Europe but is nowadays confined to Brittany and the fringes of Britain and Ireland. This doesn't necessarily mean that Celts themselves were driven to Europe's western rim by Romans invading continental Europe and Anglo-Saxons invading England. More probably, ancient Celtic-speakers and their descendants stayed put on the land, and, over time, simply changed their speech. When natives have new rulers who speak an alien language, it must be in the natives' interest to start learning it.

Race and Indo-European Languages

Incidentally, ideas about mass migrations being common during prehistoric times arose in the Victorian age, when Europeans really were migrating en masse to the Americas and the colonial empires. But prehistoric people had no guns, railroads, or steamships, and would have found it much harder than nineteenth-century European colonists to migrate and to conquer natives. Anthropologists rarely find skeletal evidence of mass migrations in prehistory, because the skeletal record largely speaks of biological continuity. So too does Europe's genetic record, for the most part, even going as far back as the Ice Ages.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The discovery that ancient and modern Indo-European languages were spoken over a vast area came as a big jolt to educated people in the nineteenth century. They were staggered that all these languages were descended from a single ancestor. Indeed, the great French linguist Antoine Meillet likened the impact of the discovery of the Indo-Europeans to Columbus's discovery of the New World.

Meillet was right. For one thing, because scholars can reconstruct a good deal of the Proto-Indo-Europeans' language—and, by similar comparative methods, their customs and mythology—we moderns can glimpse a prehistoric mentality. No longer restricted to such humdrum archaeological finds as stone tools and charred seeds, we can get inside the minds of the distant Proto-Indo-Europeans and understand their outlook on life.

Many people also find something intriguing in the idea that one fairly small prehistoric population and its descendants somehow managed to expand across most of Europe and much of Asia, disseminating their language and culture on the way. After all, the Proto-Indo-Europeans' descendants provided much of the language and culture for the civilizations of ancient India, Iran, Greece, Rome, and Celtic and Germanic Europe.

Not surprisingly, Proto-Indo-Europeans were greatly admired by such earlier racial historians as the Count de Gobineau and Madison Grant and, of course, the Aryans were also the favorite people of Adolf Hitler. This enthusiasm for Proto-Indo-Europeans as the ancestors of the white race and European culture has contributed to the contemporary taboo against Westerners identifying too closely with their racial origins.

The racial origins of the Proto-Indo-Europeans are, like race and IQ or race and crime, a red-hot subject. Take the case of Professor Wolfram Nagel of Berlin University, who in 1987 argued in the journal of the German Oriental Society that Proto-Indo-Europeans must have been racially northern European.[5] He didn't say they were a master race or destined to conquer the world, just that they were northern European. Although Professor Nagel had reached the top of his profession, his reasoned arguments based on ancient texts and artworks so appalled the learned society that they fired the journal's editors and debated whether to expel him (although in the event they allowed him to stay). This incident offers an insight into the totalitarian climate that intellectuals work under in "democratic" Germany.

Similarly in France, two intellectuals whose books and articles describe Proto-Indo-Europeans as racially northern European—Alain de Benoist,[6] the leading figure of the French New Right, and Professor Jean Haudry—are routinely vilified as Nazis. Westerners are living in a strange world, when discussing the origins of their people and culture can land them in so much trouble.

The Search for the Proto-Indo-Europeans' Homeland

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As noted above, the location of the Proto-Indo-European homeland has long been the subject of speculation. One might begin the search for it by deciding if the reconstructed Proto-Indo-European language offers any clues about where or when its speakers may have lived. Proto-Indo-European had words for houses, for taming animals, for wagons and for pottery, implying that its people must have lived during the Neolithic or even later, which gives us a general time-frame for the period of archaeological cultures and skeletal material that prehistorians should be examining.[7] In addition, the earliest words from one of Proto-Indo-European's daughter languages, Hittite in Anatolia, appeared around 1900 B.C., and so Proto-Indo-European itself must have existed at least a few centuries earlier, before developing into Hittite, and so perhaps before about 2500 B.C.

Proto-Indo-Europeans can therefore be placed vaguely in time. But prehistorians struggle to pin them down geographically. Over the years, scholars and cranks alike have offered dozens of apparent solutions to the problem of the Proto-Indo-European homeland. Many seemingly ingenious proposals have seized on just one reconstructed Proto-Indo-European word, such as beech or salmon, to determine where these occurred in prehistoric times and delimit the homeland, but so far no proposal has worked. All these proposals turn out to be too vague. (One Icelandic linguist offered an especially bizarre idea, arguing that the harsh sound of some Proto-Indo-European words imitates seabirds living around the Baltic.)

Turning to more serious matters, once ancient people had given up hunting and gathering, which necessitated roaming across wide territories, and had taken up the Neolithic, including farming and settling down into hamlets and villages, becoming more or less rooted to the soil, their populations became relatively isolated from one another, and over time their languages also became isolated, accumulating more and more differences from one another. Judging by parts of the world that even now have a Neolithic way of life, the original homeland of the Proto-Indo-Europeans would have been more or less the size of, say, Poland.[8]

In tracing Proto-Indo-European origins, anthropology offers three main kinds of evidence in Europe and Asia. First, the genetic data, though so far almost all our data comes from modern populations. Second, the masses of information from ancient times about physical types, and most important of all about hair and eye pigmentation—information that comes from texts, artworks and mummified corpses. Finally, the ancient skeletal remains. Now, anthropologists cannot immediately deduce from any archaeological culture's skeletal remains that, in life, its people spoke Proto-Indo-European. All we can do with ancient skeletal material is determine cases of population movements, and then decide if any such movements match the relevant period of Indo-European expansions and the relevant lands penetrated by Indo-Europeans.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Likewise with modern genetic material, we can use it only to locate ancient population movements that might correspond with Indo-European expansions.

The ancient texts and artworks recording human pigmentation offer a different kind of evidence. After all, these texts and artworks come from, or are about, historical societies that were certainly Indo-European-speaking, and so some, if not all or even many, of the people in these societies were descended from Proto-Indo-Europeans, as I hope to show later.

Anyway, let's begin with the genetic evidence. Any similar article written in 2020 will discuss at length the evidence of ancient DNA. Ancient DNA taken from human teeth and bone will revolutionize the study of prehistory. It will tell us about the sex of individual ancient humans, their familial relationships and their biological affinities and ancestries. Geneticists might one day draw up a family tree for all the populations of ancient Europe and Asia. And once geneticists have located the genes controlling hair and eye colors, we can speculate about the likely pigmentation of ancient human populations. We shall also use DNA from ancient domesticated crops and animals to explain how early farming expanded.

At present, though, ancient DNA has revealed only that modern humans are not, as Carleton Coon once believed, descended from Neanderthals.[9] But as for Indo-Europeans, current studies of ancient DNA tell us next to nothing.

Many prehistorians have used modern genetic data to work out where Proto-Indo-Europeans came from and how they expanded, but most of their ideas are chasing down blind alleys.[10] For example, many analyses try to match modern genetic boundaries with modern or ancient linguistic boundaries, arguing that neighbors who speak different languages rarely marry each other, and so over time their populations have diverged genetically. But populations divided genetically and linguistically are also often separated by such physical boundaries as mountains and seas, and this factor complicates matters inextricably.[11]

This article touches very briefly on a few of the more important findings from genetic studies. First of all, it turns out that, in genetic terms, modern Europe is very homogeneous, and northern Europe even more so. Genetic distances between northern European populations are usually low—between English and Germans, for example, English and French, and English and Irish. In contrast, many genetic distances in southern and eastern Europe are a good deal higher, such as those between Greeks and Hungarians, and Greeks and Yugoslavs.[12]

Genetically, Greek and Yugoslav populations are among the least typically "European." And the significance of this impinges on Colin Renfrew's hypothesis that around 7000 B.C. Proto-Indo-Europeans were farmers in Anatolia, and indeed farming so well that their big population increases enabled them and their descendants to spread across most of Europe in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

course of thousands of years, mixing with indigenous Europeans on the way.[13] Yet it seems odd that Greeks should be divided by fairly large genetic distances from Hungarians and Yugoslavs if Anatolian farmers really had expanded via southeast Europe en masse. One might expect such a large-scale population movement to have homogenized gene pools in southeast Europe.

A particular kind of DNA is mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA), which has nothing to do with shaping physical or personality traits. Both males and females carry mtDNA, although only mothers pass it on, and when it is inherited there are occasional mutations. In consequence, geneticists can examine mtDNA lineages to determine how they evolved into new types. And comparing lineages from different populations allows us to work out *where* various lineages arose and, if we estimate mutation rates, *when* they arose.

Bryan Sykes and others classify modern European mtDNA in nine major lineage groups. Sykes finds that eight of these nine groups arose in Europe as long ago as the Upper Palaeolithic, during the time of the Ice Ages.[14] But one lineage group which originated in southwest Asia entered Europe during the last 10,000 years and currently occurs across much of Europe, perhaps comprising 17% of modern European lineages, although another study puts it at more like 10%.[15] This lineage group, Sykes argues, ran in two streams—one common along the Mediterranean coast to Spain, Portugal and from there along the Atlantic coast to Cornwall, Wales and western Scotland, the other common in the river valleys of central Europe. And these two streams, he suggests, reflect ancient Anatolian farmers spreading northward and westward across Europe.

As for the problem of Indo-European expansions, Sykes's deduction makes a neat solution. It explains how Indo-Europeans managed during prehistoric times to advance across most of Europe and part of Asia. However, his theory doesn't makes any sense—at least, not as far as Proto-Indo-Europeans are concerned. Proto-Indo-Europeans appeared later on. For one thing, the age and distribution of the mtDNA stream along the Mediterranean and Atlantic coasts might be an echo of another migration altogether—the migration that thousands of years later took megalithic tombs around the coasts of western Europe.[16]

Sykes's hypothesis also runs into difficulties with the skeletal remains.[17] Several studies of early Neolithic skeletal material find that, contrary to his hypothesis, remains from the Balkans don't really resemble remains from southwest Asia. So were these two populations related? In addition, we cannot be certain that early Neolithic remains from central Europe closely match remains from the Balkans. So this apparently unstoppable advance from Anatolia via the Balkans to northern Europe is, judging by the skeletal record, by no means proven. But even if it took place, such a population movement might still have no connection with the expansions of Indo-Europeans.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Indeed, linguists can apparently reconstruct Proto-Indo-European words for items of material culture that first appear in the archaeological record, as far as we know, only from the fourth millennium B.C. onwards. Some of these words are for wagon, axle, wheel, and reins.[18] But if Proto-Indo-Europeans still existed as a unified population at this late date, then they cannot have begun separating as long ago as 7000 B.C., when wheeled vehicles were still unknown.

The pattern of languages tells a similar story. Archaic languages that preserve Proto-Indo-European forms are often found on the edge of the Indo-European world. Many correspondences link, for example, Germanic in northern Europe and Tocharian in central Asia. Indeed, the Indo-European branch retaining the highest percentage of reconstructed Proto-Indo-European words—about 67% of them—is Germanic, followed by Greek with 60% and Baltic with 54%.[19] Again, if farmers had taken thousands of years to migrate across Europe from an Anatolian homeland, one might expect that Germanic and Baltic would have the *fewest* original words, because migrants traveling ever further into new country for thousands of years, and marrying with natives on the way, would find their original vocabulary becoming more and more diluted.

Consider also the similarity between Indo-European mythologies. Scholars of religion consider the three great reservoirs of Proto-Indo-European mythology to be Rome (think of Mars and Jupiter, Romulus and Remus), Scandinavia (think of Thor and Odin), and India (think of Indra the warrior-god and Agni the fire-god).[20] Yet, just like the most archaic languages, these three regions sit right on the edge of the Indo-European world, thousands of miles apart. But if Anatolian farmers and their descendants *had* trekked across Europe and Asia, think how much Proto-Indo-European mythology would have been lost by the time, thousands of years after setting out, that they eventually settled in such distant lands as Rome, Scandinavia and India. So perhaps Indo-European settlers made fairly swift expansions to their new lands, where they established themselves.

Ancestral Clues From Antiquity

Information about how pigmentation was distributed in antiquity provides crucial evidence in understanding where Proto-Indo-Europeans originated and how they expanded, and is far too useful to be disregarded. Many students of Proto-Indo-European origins examine genetic data, and some even consider skeletal remains. But very few in recent years have said anything about ancient texts and artworks recording pigmentation. Linking Proto-Indo-Europeans with a specific pigmentation became a huge taboo once the National Socialists began promoting their doctrine of "blond Aryans," even though similar ideas go back as far as the 1820s.[21] But we should ignore taboos of political correctness.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Yet ancient sources about pigmentation are often scarce. A further problem is that the earliest useful texts from each Indo-European branch vary so much in period. The earliest useful texts about pigmentation from India come from the mid-second millennium B.C., whereas those from Ireland and Scandinavia were composed two thousand years later. Ideally, ancient peoples would have compiled anthropological surveys, but these simply don't exist. Descriptions of historical figures provide a rough population sample, although even the Greeks of the classical period virtually never reported the coloring of their greatest men. And so anthropologists must also examine the pigmentation of mythical figures and deities, working on the assumption that their physical appearance mirrors the real-life people who admired or worshiped them.

The Indo-European world covers so many lands and eras that this article will consider just six of the many regions where Indo-European-speaking peoples lived in antiquity: Ireland, Rome, Greece, Iran, India, and Xinjiang (which used to be known as Chinese Turkestan) in northwest China.

For evidence of how the Celts described themselves, we might turn to the highly traditional society of early medieval Ireland. One excellent source from Ireland is the epic *Táin Bó Cuailnge*, otherwise known as *The Cattle Raid of Cooley*, probably composed as late as the seventh or eigth century A.D. and lying at the heart of early Irish literature. The *Táin* and other Irish works contain some valuable descriptions of mythological heroes.[22] In the world they depict, beautiful women generally have fair hair and blue eyes, and the great warrior-heroes, although varying more than the women, also tend to have fair hair and, when bearded, always fair beards. Moreover, early Irish tales often regard men who have dark hair as somewhat alien, because some ugly giants and male slaves are dark-haired, and even a few important dark-haired warrior-heroes are regarded as marginal figures.

In ancient Rome, some valuable descriptions of physical traits are embedded in the biographies of early emperors. The earliest nineteen Roman emperors, from Caesar up to Commodus at the end of the Age of the Antonines in A.D. 192, offer a small but exceptionally useful population sample.[23] Of these nineteen emperors, four have no descriptions and two are described only as gray-haired. But whereas one or perhaps two of the remainder have dark hair, five are described as having fair or fairish hair. And whereas three have dark eyes, nine have blue or grayish eyes, and indeed five of the first seven have blue or grayish eyes. For example, Augustus and Nero had fairish hair and blue eyes, Caesar had dark eyes, and Hadrian had dark hair and blue eyes. Although upper-class Romans tended to have a light pigmentation, they were greatly outnumbered by the Roman masses, who overwhelmingly had dark hair and eyes.

In Greece, Homer's two epics from the eighth century B.C., the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, are among the earliest texts in Europe containing useful information about pigmentation.[24] When characterizing his Greek warrior-heroes, Homer

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

says nothing about the coloring of Agamemnon, but he does picture Achilles, Meleager, Menelaus, and Odysseus as fair-haired—a coloring that coincides with their youthfulness. Certainly by classical times, however, the great majority of Greeks had dark hair.

Useful information about real rather than fictional Greeks comes from Polemon, the second most important Greek writer on physiognomy, who wrote as late as the second century A.D.[25] Polemon explains that "the pure Greek" of his time has fair skin and red hair, and resembles the man inclined to literature and philosophy, who has fair skin and fairish hair. Polemon may have drawn these ideas from Pseudo-Aristotle, the most important Greek physiognomist, who in his third century B.C. *Physiognomica* declares that the most perfect male type is the lion with its fair mane.[26]

Fair Indo-Europeans from the Caspian to Turkestan

Turning to Iranians, I remarked earlier that speakers of Indo-European's so-called "Iranian" branch must have lived on the steppe before infiltrating southward to Iran, where non-Indo-European Elamites already had a civilization. Now, Greek and Roman writers in the centuries before and after Christ stated that Iranian-speaking peoples north of the Black Sea and Caspian had fair or reddish hair and blue eyes.[27] One especially trustworthy source is Ammianus Marcellinus, because he had visited the Black Sea region, unlike the writers who simply relied on others' reports, and he portrays the Alans with fairish hair.

From Iran itself, although nowadays housed in the Louvre in Paris, comes the Archer Frieze of glazed bricks, which was created about 500 B.C. to represent the bodyguards of Darius I.[28] Most of the eighteen or so archers on the frieze have dark skin, hair, and eyes, but a few have blue eyes. This frieze originally stood outdoors, causing the pigment for archers' skins to darken over time. But we do have some brick fragments showing paler skin, and Annie Caubet, the director of the Louvre's Department of Oriental Antiquities, told me in a letter that pinkish skin probably came from the frieze's portrayal of Darius himself.

Many similarities in language, as well as in mythology and culture, are shared by the Indo-European's Iranian and Indian branches, which implies that, wherever the Proto-Indo-Europeans had their homeland, the Proto-Iranians and Proto-Indians must even then have been neighbors who resembled each other physically. One similarity is that the Indo-European peoples in Iran and India both referred to themselves as Aryans. The Iranian king Darius I, in a famous rock inscription, calls himself "an Aryan of the Aryans," and the very word *Iran* developed from Aryan. These days, more and more linguists are returning to the older opinion that the term Aryan occurred throughout the Indo-European world, cropping up, for instance, in the Old

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Irish word *aire* meaning "noble, free," and hence Ireland's name of *Eire*. To the Proto-Indo-Europeans, it seems, *Aryan* meant peer or comrade or perhaps an ethnic term.[29]

In India, the earliest known Indo-European text, coming from the later second millennium B.C., is the religious work, the *Rig-Veda*.[30] Only one god in the *Rig-Veda* has anything like a human pigmentation, and he is the great warrior-god Indra. In personality and attributes, Indra resembles the Germanic god Thor, and even his fair hair and beard resemble Thor's red beard.[31] Throughout the *Rig-Veda*, Indra often helps the warlike Aryans—the Indo-European invaders of India—to battle against the native Dasas and Dasyus, who are portrayed as dark-skinned. In contrast, the *Rig-Veda* refers to Aryans as white and having an "Aryan color."

Later works from ancient India also offer useful sources, and one of them is the very long *Mahabhasya*, composed in northern India by the grammarian Patañjali in the second century B.C. [32] In this work, Patañjali, making a philosophical point about objects having and lacking attributes, casts around for an illustration that makes obvious sense to his readers. Nobody, Patañjali says, would look at a dark-skinned man and imagine that he was a brahmin, from India's highest caste. Instead, he goes on, everyone knows that brahmins have fair skins and *kapila-kesa* hair, which translates as "brown" or "reddish-brown."

Finally, abundant evidence comes from Xinjiang in northwest China, the home of people speaking Indo-European's Tocharian branch. Unfortunately, ancient Chinese sources rarely comment on the physical appearance of foreigners. But they do record that the Yuezhi, who may have been Tocharians under another name, had fair skins, and that the Wusun's descendants, again possibly Tocharian, had green (or blue) eyes and red beards.[33]

Some of the best evidence for Tocharians is artistic, because they were painted on murals in Xinjiang during the later first millennium A.D. One example is the so-called Cave of the Sixteen Sword-Bearers at Kizil.[34] Of these sixteen knights, five have white hair and eleven have light red hair. Marianne Yaldiz, the director of Berlin's Museum for Indian Art, where the murals are now housed, told me in a letter that the eyes are a sort of gray-green-blue. Although the men wear Iranian-style dress and stand in an Iranian-style pose, historians generally regard them as Tocharians.

Still, all of these sixteen figures are stereotyped. To find individual portrayals, we must turn to other murals in Xinjiang that are three hundred miles further east at Bezeklik.[35] Murals at Bezeklik chiefly portray typically Chinese faces, although all these Mongoloids are stereotyped. In contrast, the minority of Caucasoids on the murals are rendered as individual portraits, as in one cave at Bezeklik which portrays about six or seven Buddhist monks who have Caucasoid features. These Caucasoid monks are apparently a distinct ethnic group—unlike the Mongoloids, they all have heads shaven on top, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all wear similar gowns—and are almost certainly Tocharians. One or two of these Caucasoid monks have dark hair and brown eyes, but most have reddish-brown hair and blue or green eyes.

In recent years, archaeologists working in Xinjiang's Tarim Basin have excavated more than one hundred Caucasoid mummies, thanks to a desert climate and salty soil's having preserved corpses. Even some mummies 3,000 years old look as though they were buried days ago. These Caucasoid mummies have typically northern European faces, with prominent noses, unslanted eyes, and hair that is usually fair or light brown.[36] Although the mummies' eyes have long since perished, we know that two infants were buried with stones placed over their eyes, one with green stones and one with blue, colors perhaps representing their irises.[37] Judging by the mummies' location, historians conclude that at least the great majority of these Caucasoids were ancestral Tocharians.

Origins on the Steppe?

Does this brief survey of pigmentation in ancient Ireland, Rome, Greece, Iran, India, and Xinjiang tell us anything? I think it clearly does. Light-haired and light-eyed types were found all over the ancient Indo-European world, even in lands which at present are overwhelmingly dark in pigmentation, such as Rome and India. And traces of these northern European types occurred especially among the warriors who comprised each society's ruling class.

Ireland had an abundance of fair-haired warrior-heroes. Most of the early Greek warrior-heroes had fair hair, too. In fact, most of the early Roman emperors had fair or fairish hair and blue eyes. The Iranians who lived on the steppe north of the Black and Caspian Sea were also described by foreign observers as having fair or fairish hair. Indian Brahmins have been characterized as having fair skins and brown or reddish-brown hair, and the Indian warrior-god Indra apparently had fair hair as well. Finally, the mummies and murals of Xinjiang reveal that most Tocharians had fair or brownish hair and blue or green eyes.

Moreover, Indo-Europeans often seem to have been small minorities in the countries they penetrated: the Celtic warrior-class in Ireland; the Roman patricians; the few Homeric heroes and the so-called "pure Greeks" of later years; and the Aryans battling against the many natives in India. Then again, the majority of Tocharians in Xinjiang apparently had light pigmentation, as did most Iranians living on the steppe.

Indeed, many prehistorians believe that the Proto-Indo-European homeland lay on the steppe, which, if true, might explain why steppe Iranians retained the Proto-Indo-Europeans' northern European physical type. A steppe homeland, moreover, would have been a good basis for Indo-European expansions. Steppe groups during the third millennium B.C. and earlier lived

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mainly by cattle and sheep herding, and by at least the third millennium B.C. they had also domesticated the horse. Down to historical times, such other steppe pastoralists as the Huns and Mongols have been highly mobile horseriders and warlike, too, living in the midst of poor farmland and consequently raiding neighbors for food supplies. So if Proto-Indo-Europeans did originate on the steppe, they may also have been highly expansionist.

To confirm that Proto-Indo-Europeans did originate on the steppe, we must find traces in the skeletal record of prehistoric steppe groups expanding across the known Indo-European world—to Xinjiang, Iran, India, Greece, Rome, and northern Europe. The evidence of pigmentation surveyed above implies that Indo-Europeans were usually minorities in the lands they entered, and must have expanded from their homeland in smallish groups. This finding tallies broadly with the skeletal record, which in general points to continuity in prehistoric Europe and Asia, where population movements on a large scale were the rare exception.

But prehistoric steppe groups did extend as far east as southern Siberia and Xinjiang, as demonstrated by both archaeological evidence and the remains of robust skeletal types.[38] At present, though, traces of these steppe groups have not been found entering Iran or India, and neither can they be located as far west as Italy. In the northern Balkans, prehistoric steppe groups are certainly represented by skeletal and archaeological remains, but did they penetrate as far south as Greece? Archaeological traces of steppe groups largely peter out before Greece, but the renowned Grave Circle B at Mycenae resembles steppe tombs, and the very rugged nobles buried here also resemble steppe groups.[39] Steppe groups definitely expanded as far westward as central Europe as well, judging by the three thousand steppe graves known in eastern Hungary, and, although the females buried here seem lightly built, the males are similar to robust steppe types.[40]

But did steppe groups reach northern Europe? It is there that several important Indo-European peoples first emerge into history: Slavs, Balts, Germans, and Celts. The archaeological record is ambiguous: there are many disputed parallels between the Late Neolithic culture of northern Europe, known as Corded Ware, and Neolithic steppe culture, although vague cultural parallels can't automatically be attributed to migrating groups. The skeletal remains are less ambiguous, however, because they show no traces of steppe groups reaching northern Europe. The typically Corded Ware skulls from Germany, Czechoslovakia , and Poland are high and have narrow faces, whereas steppe crania are low and have broad faces.[41]

The archaeological and skeletal evidence seems to leave us with three possibilities. First, that steppe groups *did* reach northern Europe, but in such small numbers it makes it nearly impossible to detect them. Second, that steppe groups didn't reach northern Europe, which proves that, at least in this region,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

steppe groups were not transmitting Indo-European speech. Third, that steppe groups didn't need to reach northern Europe, because Proto-Indo-Europeans lived in a vast homeland that encompassed the steppe *and* northern Europe.

The puzzle remains. But steppe groups must somehow be implicated in Proto-Indo-European origins. They, and they alone among prehistoric groups, expanded to much of Europe and Asia where Indo-European languages were known to have been spoken. Perhaps one day archaeologists and anthropologists will determine exactly the prehistoric links, if any, between the steppe and northern Europe. Scholars might also have a clearer picture about Indo-European influences in eastern Asia—on the civilizations of China, where Indo-Europeans may have introduced bronze-working and the chariot, and Japan, whose mythology bears unmistakable affinities with Proto-Indo-European mythology.[42]

What we can declare is that Indo-Europeans tended to expand in small groups, and that in the great civilizations of Ireland, Rome, Greece, and India they and their descendants were heavily outnumbered minorities who were concentrated in the ruling classes. I take it that Indo-Europeans were ruling these lands because they had somehow dominated the natives by force of arms, although the archaeological evidence for this assertion scarcely exists. So far, prehistorians have found it perplexing to explain from the archaeological record how Indo-Europeans arrived in any land and established themselves as the commanding power.

And what happened to these Indo-Europeans? It appears that at least Europe and southern Asia were so densely populated by Neolithic times that small groups of newcomers would have made little biological impact on the natives. Since Proto-Indo-Europeans began expanding about five thousand years ago, two hundred generations have passed, and the few drops of their original blood have been lost in an ocean of non-Indo-Europeans. Traces of light hair and eyes crop up now and again in modern Iran and northern India, and even in Xinjiang, where Dolkun Kamberi, a local expert on the Caucasoid mummies, has green eyes and light brown hair. Light hair and eyes are more common in modern Greece and Rome and especially Ireland, although in northern Europe most traces probably predate any incoming Indo-Europeans.

In a journal about the West and its future, it is fitting to end this article by briefly recounting the fate of the Roman upper class. Among Indo-European peoples, the Romans offer an especially useful example because they left masses of records, enabling later historians to determine what became of them. The evidence found in ancient texts implies that this class descended largely from Indo-Europeans who had a decidedly northern European physical type, although that isn't something one reads in modern books about Roman history. In Rome, though, the upper class was always a tiny minority. Instead of protecting its interests, it allowed itself to wither away. Consider a bleak statistic. We know of about fifty patrician clans in the fifth century B.C., but

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the time of Caesar, in the later first century B.C., only fourteen of these had survived.[43] The decay continued in imperial times. We know of the families of nearly four hundred Roman senators in A.D. sixty five, but, just one generation later, all trace of half of these families had vanished.[44]

If we in the West want to avoid a similar fate, we must learn from Indo-European history.

John V. Day, Ph.D., is the author of ***Indo-European Origins: The Anthropological Evidence*** *(The Institute for the Study of Man, 2001) and is the editor of the forthcoming anthology,* ***The Lost Philosopher: The Best of Anthony M. Ludovici.***

END NOTES

1. For an excellent introduction to the subject, see Shan M.M. Winn, *Heaven, Heroes, and Happiness: The Indo-European Roots of Western Ideology*, Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1995. See also John V. Day, *Indo-European Origins: The Anthropological Evidence*, Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man, 2001.

2. In the interests of clarity, linguists have transliterated the Greek, Sanskrit, and Proto-Indo-European words in the following examples into the Roman alphabet, removed any accents, and used only the root of each word without any suffixes.

3. For a survey of modern English words that ultimately derive from Proto-Indo-European, see Calvert Watkins, *The American Heritage Dictionary of Indo-European Roots*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1985.

4. It is not only Indo-Europeans that had a wide language family. Uralic, for example, comprises Finnish, Lapp, Estonian and Hungarian and various languages of northwest Asia. But in modern Europe the only significant peoples who do not speak Indo-European languages are Basques, Hungarians, Finns, Estonians, and Georgians. Together, these non-Indo-European-speakers number only about 25 million out of over 500 million Europeans.

5. Wolfram Nagel, "Indogermanen und Alter Orient -- Rückblick und Ausblick auf den Stand des Indogermanenproblems," *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* 119, 1987, pp. 157-213.

6. Alain de Benoist, "Indo-Européens: à la recherche du foyer d'origine; quatre remarques finales," *Nouvelle École* 49, 1997, pp. 13-105.

7. Day, pp. 4-6.

8. Day, p. 8.

9. Bryan Sykes, *The Seven Daughters of Eve*, New York: W.W. Norton, 2001, p. 126.

10. Patrick Sims-Williams, "Genetics, Linguistics, and Prehistory: Thinking Big and Thinking Straight," *Antiquity* 72, 1998, pp. 505-27.

11. Day, pp. 253-66.

12. L. Luca Cavalli-Sforza, Paolo Menozzi, and Alberto Piazza, *The History and Geography of Human Genes*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994, p. 270.

13. Colin Renfrew, *Archaeology and Language: The Puzzle of Indo-European Origins*, London: Jonathan Cape, 1987.

14. Day, p. 277; Sykes, pp. 184, 196.

15. Day, pp. 279-80.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

16. Day, pp. 278-9.
17. Day, pp. 221-33.
18. J.P. Mallory and D.Q. Adams, eds., *Encyclopedia of Indo-European Culture*, Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1997, pp. 481, 625-8.
19. Day, p. 24.
20. Jaan Puhvel, *Comparative Mythology*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, paperback edition, 1989, p. 39.
21. Day, p. 125.
22. Day, pp. 107-13.
23. Day, pp. 102-6
.24. Day, pp. 87-92.
25. Day, p. 94.
26. Day, pp. 94-5.
27. Day, p. 57.
28. Day, pp. 134-6.
29. Puhvel, p. 45; Mallory and Adams, p. 213.
30. Day, pp. 74-9.
31. Day, pp. 79, 115-16.
32. Day, pp. 80-2.
33. Day, pp. 58-9.
34. Day, pp. 137-8; J.P. Mallory and Victor H. Mair, *The Tarim Mummies: Ancient China and the Mystery of the Earliest Peoples from the West*, London: Thames & Hudson, 2000, plate XII.
35. Day, pp. 138-9; Mallory and Mair, Plate XIII.
36. Day, pp. 351-5; Mallory and Mair, pp. 181-200.
37. Day, p. 352 n. 1.
38. Day, pp.184-7, 190-4.
39. Day, pp. 199-200.
40. Day, p. 209.
41. Day, p. 206.
42. Mallory and Mair, pp. 324-6, 327-8; Michael Puett, "China in Early Eurasian History: A Brief Review of Recent Scholarship on the Issue," in Victor H. Mair, ed., *The Bronze Age and Early Iron Age Peoples of Eastern Central Asia*, Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Museum Publications, 2 volumes, 1998, pp. 699-715; C. Scott Littleton, "The Indo-European Strain in Japanese Mythology: A Review of Some Recent Research," *Mankind Quarterly* 26, 1985-6, pp. 152-74.
43. Arnaldo Momigliano and Tim J. Cornell, "Patricians," in Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth, eds., *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, New York: Oxford University Press, 3rd edition, 1996, p. 1123.
44. James Paton Isaac, *Factors in the Ruin of Antiquity: A Criticism of Ancient Civilization*, Canada: no publisher, 1971, p. 421. See also Nathaniel Weyl and Stefan T. Possony, *The Geography of Intellect*, Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1963, pp. 106-9; Ilse Schwidetzky, *Das Problem des Völkertodes: Eine Studie zur historischen Bevölkerungsbiologie*, Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke, 1954, pp. 43-53.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Legacy of a European Traditionalist
Julius Evola in Perspective

Guido Stucco

This article is a brief introduction to the life and central ideas of the controversial Italian thinker Julius Evola (1898-1974), one of the leading representatives of the European right and of the "Traditionalist movement"[1] in the twentieth century. This movement, together with the Theosophical Society, played a leading role in promoting the study of ancient eastern wisdom, esoteric doctrines, and spirituality. Unlike the Theosophical Society, which championed democratic and egalitarian views,[2] an optimistic view of progress, and a belief in spiritual evolution, the Traditionalist movement adopted an elitist and antiegalitarian stance, a pessimistic view of ordinary life and of history, and an uncompromising rejection of the modern world. The Traditionalist movement began with René Guénon (1886-1951), a French philosopher and mathematician who converted to Islam and moved to Cairo in 1931, following the death of his first wife. Guénon revived interest in the concept of Tradition, i.e., the teachings and doctrines of ancient civilizations and religions, emphasizing its perennial value over and against the "modern world" and its offshoots: humanistic individualism, relativism, materialism, and scientism. Other important Traditionalists of the past century have included Ananda Coomaraswamy, Frithjof Schuon, and Julius Evola.

This article is addressed, first, to persons who claim to be conservative and of rightist persuasion. It is my contention that Evola's political views can help the American right to acquire a greater intellectual relevance and to overcome its provincialism and narrow horizons. The criticism most frequently leveled by the European "New Right" against American conservatives is that the ideological poverty of the American Right lies in its circling its wagons around a conservative agenda, in its inability to see the greater scheme of things.[3] By disclosing to his readers the value and worth of the world of Tradition, Evola has shown that to be a rightist entails much more than taking a stance on civic and social issues, such as abortion, capital punishment, a strong military, free enterprise, less taxes, less government, fierce patriotism, and the right to bear arms, but rather assessing more crucial matters involving race, ethnicity, eugenics, immigration, and the nature of the nation-state.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Second, readers with an active interest in spiritual and metaphysical matters may find Evola's thought insightful and his exposition of ancient esoteric techniques very helpful. Moreover, his views, though at times very critical and astute, have the potential of becoming a catalyst for personal transformation and spiritual growth.

To date, Evola's work has been subjected to the silent treatment. When Evola is not ignored, he is usually vilified by leftist scholars and intellectuals, who demonize him as a bad teacher, racist, rabid anti-Semite, master mind of right-wing terrorism, fascist guru, or so filthy a racist even to touch him would be repugnant. The writer Martin Lee, whose knowledge of Evola is of the most superficial sort, called him a "Nazi philosopher" and claimed that "Evola helped compose Italy's belated racialist laws toward the end of the Fascist rule."[4] Others have minimized his contribution altogether. Walter Laqueur, in his *Fascism: Past, Present, Future*, did not hesitate to call him a "learned charlatan, an eclecticist, not an innovator," and suggested "there were elements of pure nonsense also in his later work."[5] Umberto Eco sarcastically nicknamed Evola "Othelma, the Magician."

The most valuable summaries to date of Evola's life and work in the English language have been written by Thomas Sheehan and Richard Drake.[6] Until either a biography of Evola or his … autobiography becomes available to the English-speaking world, these articles remain the best reference sources for his life and work. Both scholars are well versed in Italian culture, politics, and language. Although not sympathetic to Evola's ideas, they were the first to introduce the Italian thinker's views to the American public. Unfortunately, their interpretations of Evola's work are very reductive. Sheehan and Drake succumb to the dominant leftist propaganda according to which Evola is a "bad teacher" because he allegedly supplied ideological justification for a bloody campaign by right wing terrorists in Italy during the 1980s.[7] Regrettably, both authors have underestimated Evola's *spissitudo spiritualis* as an esotericist and a Traditionalist, and have written about Evola merely as a case study in their fields of competence, i.e., philosophy and history, respectively.[8]

Despite his many detractors, Evola has enjoyed something of a revival in the past twenty years. His works have been translated into French, German,[9] Spanish, and English, as well as Portuguese, Hungarian, and Russian. Conferences devoted to the study of this or that aspect of Evola's thought are mushrooming everywhere in Europe.[10] Thus, paraphrasing the title of Edward Albee's play, we may want to ask: "Who's afraid of Julius Evola?" And, most important, why?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Evola's Life

Julius Evola died of heart failure at his Rome apartment on June 11, 1974, at the age of seventy-six. Before he died he asked to be seated at his desk in order to face the sun's light streaming through the open window. In accordance with his will, his body was cremated and the urn containing his ashes was buried in a crevasse on Monte Rosa, in the Italian Alps.

Evola's writing career spanned more than half a century. It is possible to distinguish three periods in his intellectual development. First came an artistic period (1916-1922), during which he embraced dadaism and futurism, wrote poetry, and painted in the abstract style. The reader may recall that dadaism was an avant-garde movement founded by Tristan Tzara, characterized by a yearning for absolute freedom and by a revolt against all prevalent logical, ethical, and aesthetic canons.

Evola turned next to the study of philosophy (1923-1927), developing an ingenuous perspective that could be characterized as "transidealistic," or as a solipsistic development of mainstream idealism. After learning German in order to be able to read the original texts of the main idealist philosophers (Schelling, Fichte, and Hegel), Evola accepted their chief premise, that being is the product of thought. Yet he also attempted to overcome the passivity of the subject toward "reality" typical of idealist philosophy and of its Italian offshoots, represented by Giovanni Gentile and Benedetto Croce, by outlining the path leading to the "Absolute Individual," to the status enjoyed by one who succeeds in becoming free (ab-solutus) from the conditionings of the empirical world. During this period Evola wrote *Saggi sull'idealismo magico* (Essays on magical idealism), *Teoria dell'individuo assoluto* (Theory of the absolute individual), and *Fenomenologia dell'individuo assoluto* (Phenomenology of the absolute individual), a massive work in which he employs the values of freedom, will, and power to expound his philosophy of action. As the Italian philosopher Marcello Veneziani wrote in his doctoral dissertation: "Evola's absolute I is born out of the ashes of nihilism; with the help of insights derived from magic, theurgy, alchemy and esotericism, it ascends to the highest peaks of knowledge, in the quest for that wisdom that is found on the paths of initiatory doctrines."[11]

In the third and final phase of his intellectual formation, Evola became involved in the study of esotericism and occultism (1927-1929). During this period he cofounded and directed the so-called Ur group, which published monthly monographs devoted to the presentation of esoteric and initiative disciplines and teachings. "Ur" derives from the archaic root of the word "fire"; in German it also means "primordial" or "original." In 1955 these monographs were collected and published in three volumes under the title *Introduzione alla magia quale scienza dell'Io*.[12] In the over twenty articles Evola wrote for the Ur group, under the pseudonym "EA" (Ea in ancient Akkadian mythology was

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the god of water and wisdom) and in the nine articles he wrote for *Bylichnis* (the name signifies a lamp with two wicks), an Italian Baptist periodical, Evola laid out the spiritual foundations of his world view.

During the 1930s and 1940s Evola wrote for a number of journals and published several books. During the Fascist era he was somewhat sympathetic to Mussolini and to fascist ideology, but his fierce sense of independence and detachment from human affairs and institutions prevented him from becoming a card-carrying member of the Fascist party. Because of his belief in the supremacy of ideas over politics and his aristocratic and anti-populist views, which at times conflicted with government policy—as in his opposition to the 1929 Concordat between the Italian state and Vatican and to the "demographic campaign" launched by Mussolini to increase Italy's population—Evola fell out of favor with influential Fascists, who shut down *La Torre* (The tower), the biweekly periodical he had founded, after only ten issues (February-June 1930).[13]

Evola devoted four books to the subject of race, criticizing National Socialist biological racism and developing a doctrine of race on the basis of the teachings of Tradition: *Il mito del sangue* (The myth of blood); *Sintesi di una dottrina della razza* (Synthesis of a racial doctrine); *Tre aspetti del problema ebraico* (Three aspects of the Jewish question); *Elementi di una educazione razziale* (Elements of a racial education). In these books the author outlined his tripartite anthropology of body, soul, and spirit. The spirit is the principle that determines one's attitude toward the sacred, destiny, life and death. Thus, according to Evola, the cultivation of the "spiritual race" should take precedence over the selection of the somatic race, which is determined by the laws of genetics and with which the Nazis were obsessed. Evola's antimaterialistic and non-biological racial views won Mussolini's enthusiastic endorsement. The Nazis, for their part, were suspicious of and even critical of Evola's "nebulous" theories, accusing him of watering down the empirical, biological element to promote an abstract, spiritualist, and semi-Catholic view of race.

Before and during World War II, Evola traveled and lectured in several European countries, practicing mountain climbing as a spiritual exercise in his spare time. After Mussolini was freed from his Italian captors in a daring German raid led by SS-Hauptsturmführer Otto Skorzeny, Evola was among a handful of faithful followers who met him at Hitler's headquarters in Rastenburg, East Prussia, on September 14, 1943. While sympathetic to the newly formed Fascist government in the north of Italy, which continued to fight on the Germans' side against the Allies, Evola rejected its republican and socialist agenda, its populist style, and its antimonarchical sentiments.

When the Allies entered Rome in June 1944, their secret services attempted to arrest Evola, who was living there at the time. As his elderly mother stalled the MPs, Evola slipped out of the door undetected, and made his way to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

northern Italy, and then to Austria. While in Vienna, he began to study … secret archives confiscated from various European Masonic lodges by the Germans.

One day in 1945, as Evola was walking the deserted streets of the Austrian capital during a Soviet air attack, a bomb exploded a few yards away from him. The blast threw him against a wooden plank. Evola fell on his back, and awoke in the hospital. He had suffered a compression of the bone marrow, paralyzing him from the waist down. Common sense tells one that walking a city's deserted streets during aerial bombardments is madness, if not suicide. But Evola was used to courting danger. Or, as he once put it, to follow "the norm of not avoiding dangers, but on the contrary, to seek them out, [i]s an implicit way of questioning fate."[14] That is not to say that he believed in "blind" fate. As he once wrote:

> There is no question that one is born with certain tendencies, vocations and predispositions, which at times are very obvious and specific, though at other times are hidden and likely to emerge only in particular circumstances or trials. We all have a margin of freedom in regard to this innate, differentiated element. [15]

Evola was determined to question his fate, especially at a time when an entire era was coming to an end.[16] But what he had anticipated during the air raid was either death or the attainment of a new perspective on life, not paralysis. He struggled for a long time with that particular outcome, trying to make sense of his "karma":

> Remembering why I had willed it [i.e., the paralysis] and to understand its deeper meaning was to me the only thing that ultimately mattered, something far more important than to "recover," to which I never really attributed much importance anyway.[17]

Evola had ventured outdoors during the air raid in order to test his fate, for he firmly believed in the Traditional, classical doctrine that all the major events that occur in our lives are not purely casual or the outcome of our efforts, but rather the deliberate result of a prenatal choice, something that has been willed by "us" before we were born.

Three years prior to his paralysis, Evola wrote:

> Life here on earth cannot be viewed as a coincidence. Moreover, it should not be regarded as something we can either accept or reject at will, nor as a reality that imposes itself on us, before which we can only remain passive, or display an attitude of obtuse resignation. Rather, what arises in some people is the sensation that earthly life is something to which, prior to our becoming terrestrial beings, we have committed ourselves, both as an adventure and as a mission or a chosen task, undertaking a whole set of problematic and tragic elements as well.[18]

There followed a five-year period of inactivity. First, Evola spent a year and a half in a Vienna hospital. In 1948, thanks to the intervention of a friend with the International Red Cross, he was sent back to Italy. He stayed in a hospital in Bologna for at least another year, where he underwent an unsuccessful

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

laminectomy (a surgical procedure in which part of a vertebra is removed in order to relieve pressure on the nerves of the spinal cord). Evola returned to his Roman residence in 1949, where he lived as an invalid for the next twenty-five years.

While in Bologna, Evola was visited by his friend Clemente Rebora, a poet who became a Christian, and then a Catholic priest in the order of the Rosminian Fathers. After reading about their friendship in one of Evola's works, in 1997 I visited the headquarters of the order and asked to talk to the person in charge of Rebora's archives, in hopes of discovering a previously unknown correspondence between them. No correspondence surfaced, but the priest in charge of the archive was kind enough to give me a copy of a couple of letters Rebora wrote to a friend concerning Evola. The following summary of those letters is revealing of Evola's view of religion, and of Christianity in particular.[19]

In 1949 a fellow priest, Goffredo Pistoni, solicited Rebora to visit Evola. Rebora asked permission of his provincial superior, and upon receiving it traveled from Rovereto to Evola's hospital in Bologna. Rebora was animated by the desire to see Evola embrace the Christian faith and intended to be a good witness of the gospel. In a letter to Pistoni, Rebora asked for his assistance so that he would not spoil the "most merciful ways of Infinite Love, and, if [my visit was to be] unhelpful, at least not [turn out to be] harmful." On March 20, 1949, Rebora wrote to his friend Pistoni on the letterhead of the Salesian Institute of Bologna:

> I have just returned from our Evola: we talked at great length and left each other in a brotherly mood, though I did not detect any visible change on his part which after all I could not expect. I have felt him to be like one yearning to "join the rest of the army," as he said himself, waiting to see what will happen to him . . . I have sensed in him a thirst for the absolute, which nevertheless eludes Him who said: "Let anyone who is thirsty come to me and drink."[20]

Rebora's frustration with Evola's unwillingness to abandon his views and embrace the Christian faith is evident in the comment with which he closes the first half of his letter:

> Let us pray that his previous books, which he is about to reprint, and a few new titles that will be published soon, may not chain him down, considering the success they have, and may not damage people's souls, leading them astray in the direction of a false spirituality, as they "follow false images of the Good." [Probably a quote from Dante's *Divine Comedy.* —G.S.]

Rebora concluded his letter on May 12, 1949, adding:

> Having returned to headquarters I am finally concluding this letter by telling you that a supernatural tenderness is growing in my heart for him. He [Evola] told me about an inner event that occurred to him during the bombing of Vienna, which, he added, is still mysterious to him, as he undergoes this present trial. On the contrary, I trust I am able to detect the providential and decisive meaning of this event for his soul.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rebora wrote again to Evola, asking him if he was willing to travel to Lourdes on a special train on which Rebora served as a spiritual director. Evola politely refused and the contact between the two eventually ended. Evola never converted to Christianity. In a 1935 letter written to a friend of his, Girolamo Comi, another poet who had become a Christian, Evola claimed:

> As far as I am concerned, in regard to the "conversion" that really matters, and not that which is based on feelings or on a religious faith, I have been all right since thirteen years ago [i.e., 1922, the transition year between the artistic and philosophical periods].[21]

René Guénon wrote to the convalescent Evola[22] suggesting that the latter had been the victim of a curse or magical spell cast by some powerful enemy. Evola replied that he considered that unlikely, for the circumstances to be summoned (e.g., the exact moment of the bomb's landing, the place where Evola happened to be at that moment), would have required too powerful a spell. Mircea Eliade, the renowned historian of religion, who corresponded with Evola throughout his life, once remarked to one of his own students: "Evola was wounded in the third chakra—and don't you find that significant?"[23] Since the corresponding affective forces of the third chakra are anger, violence, and pride, one may wonder whether Eliade meant that the wound sustained by Evola could have had a purifying effect on the Italian thinker, or whether it was the consequence of his hubris. In any event, Evola rejected the idea that his paralysis was a sort of "punishment" for his "promethean" efforts in the spiritual domain. For the rest of his life he endured his condition with admirable stoicism, in rigorous coherence with his beliefs.[24]

For the next two decades Evola received visitors, friends, and young people who regarded themselves his disciples. According to Gianfranco de Turris, who met him for the first time in 1967, one could sense that he was a "person of high caliber," though he did not show off or assume snobbish attitudes. Evola would wear a monocle and rest his cheek on a clenched fist, observing his visitor with curiosity. He did not like the idea of having "disciples," and jokingly referred to his admirers as "Evolomani" ("Evola maniacs"). In not seeking to recruit followers, he was probably mindful of Buddha's injunction to proclaim the truth without attempting to persuade or dissuade: "One should know approval and one should know disapproval, and having known approval, having known disapproval, one should neither approve nor disapprove, one should simply teach *dhamma*."[25]

Central Themes in Evola's Thought

In Evola's literary production it is possible to single out three major themes, which are strictly interwoven and mutually dependent. These themes represent three facets of his philosophy of action. I have designated these themes with terms borrowed from ancient Greek. The first theme is *xeniteia*, a word that refers to the condition of living abroad, or of being absent from one's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

homeland. In Evola's works one can easily detect a sense of alienation, of not belonging to what he called the "modern world." According to ancient peoples, *xeniteia* was not an enviable condition. To live surrounded by barbarous people and customs, away from one's polis, when not the result of a personal choice was often the result of a judicial sentence. We may recall that exile was often meted out to undesirable elements of an ancient society, e.g., the short-lived practice of ostracism in ancient Athens; the fate that befell many ancient Romans, including the Stoic philosopher Seneca; the deportation of entire families or populations, etc.

Throughout his life, Evola never really "fit in." Whether during his artistic, philosophical, or esoteric phase, he always felt like a straggler, seeking to link up with "the rest of the 'army.'" The modern world he denounced in his masterpiece, *Revolt against the Modern World*, took its revenge on him: at the end of the war he was surrounded by a world of ruins, isolated, avoided, and reviled. Yet he managed to retain a composed, dignified attitude and to continue in his self-appointed task of night-watchman.

The second theme is *apoliteia*, or abstention from active participation in the construction of the human polis. Evola's recommendation was that while living in exile from the world of Tradition and from the Golden Age, one should avoid the encroaching embrace of the multitudes and refrain from active participation in ordinary human affairs. *Apoliteia*, according to Evola, refers essentially to an inner attitude of indifference and detachment, but it does not necessarily entail a practical abstention from politics, as long as one engages in it with a completely detached attitude: "*Apoliteia* is the inner, irrevocable distance from this society and its 'values': it consists in not accepting being bound to society by any spiritual or moral bond."[26] This attitude is to be commended because, according to Evola, in this day and age there are no ideas, causes, and goals worthy of one's commitment.

Finally, the third theme is *autarkeia*, or self-sufficiency. The quest for spiritual independence led Evola far away from the busy crossroads of human interaction, in order to explore and expound paths of perfection and of asceticism. He became a student of ancient esoteric and occult teachings on "liberation," and published his findings in several books and articles.

XENITEIA

The following words, spoken by the Benevolent Spirit to the Destructive Spirit in the *Yasna*, a Zoroastrian collection of hymns and prayers, may serve to characterize Evola's attitude toward the modern world: "Neither our thoughts, nor teachings, nor intentions, neither our preferences nor words, neither our actions nor conceptions nor our souls are in accord."[27] Throughout his entire life Evola lived in a consistent and coherent fashion that could be simplistically dismissed as intellectual snobbism or even misanthropy. But the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reasons for Evola's rejection of the socio-political order in which lived must be sought elsewhere, namely in a well-articulated Weltanschauung, or worldview.

To be sure, Evola's sense of estrangement from the society in which he lived was reciprocated. Anyone who refuses to recognize the legitimacy of "the System," or to participate in the life of a community which he does not recognize as his own, professing instead a higher allegiance to and citizenship in another land, world, or ideology, is bound to live like a metic in ancient Greece, surrounded by suspicion and hostility.[28] In order to understand the reasons for Evola's uncompromising attitude, we need first to define the concepts of "Tradition" and "modern world" as employed by Evola in his works.

Generally speaking, the term tradition can be understood in several ways: (1) as an archetypal myth (some members of the political Right in Italy have rejected this view as an "incapacitating myth"); (2) as the way of life of a particular age, e.g., the Middle Ages, feudal Japan, the Roman Empire; (3) as the sum of three principles: "God, Country, Family"; (4) as *anamnesis*, or historical memory in general; and (5) as a body of religious teachings to be preserved and transmitted to future generations. Evola understood tradition mainly as an archetypal myth, that is, as the presence of the Absolute in specific historical and political forms. Evola's Absolute is not a religious principle or a *noumenon*, much less the God of theism, but rather a mysterious domain, or *dunamis*, power. Evola's Tradition is characterized by "Being" and stability, while the modern world is characterized by "Becoming." In the world of tradition stable socio-political institutions were in place. The world of Tradition, according to Evola, was exemplified by the ancient Roman, Greek, Indian, Chinese, and Japanese civilizations. These civilizations upheld a strict caste system; they were ruled by warrior nobilities and waged wars to expand the boundaries of their imperiums. In Evola's words:

> The traditional world knew divine kingship. It knew the bridge between the two worlds, namely initiation. It knew the two great ways of approach to the transcendent, namely heroic action and contemplation. It knew the mediation, namely rites and faithfulness. It knew the social foundation, namely the traditional law and the caste system. And it knew the political earthly symbol, namely the empire.[29]

Evola claims that the traditional world's underlying belief was the "invisible":

> It held that mere physical existence, or "living," is meaningless unless it approximates the higher world or that which is "more than life," and unless one's highest ambition consists in participating in hyperkosmia and in obtaining an active and final liberation from the bond represented by the human condition.[30]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Evola upheld a cyclical view of history, a philosophical and religious view with a rich cultural heritage. Though one may reject it, this view deserves as much respect as the linear view of history upheld by theism, to which I … subscribe, or as the progressive view championed by Engels' "scientific materialism," or as the hopeful and optimistic view typical of various New Age movements, according to which the universe is undergoing a constant and irreversible spiritual evolution. According to the cyclical view of history espoused by Hinduism, which Evola adopted and modified to fit his views, we are living in the fourth age of a complete cycle, the so-called Kali-yuga, an era characterized by decadence and disruption. According to Evola, the most remarkable phases of this "Yuga" (era) included the emergence of pre-Socratic philosophy (characterized by rejection of myth and by overemphasis on reason); the birth of Christianity; the Renaissance; Humanism; the Protestant Reformation; the Enlightenment; the French Revolution; the European revolutions of 1848; the advent of the Industrial Revolution; and Bolshevism. Thus, the "modern world" for Evola did not begin in the 1600s, but rather in the fourth century B.C.

Evola and Eliade

Evola's rejection of the modern world can be contrasted with its acceptance, promoted by Mircea Eliade (1907-1986), the renowned historian of religion whom Evola met in person several times, and with whom he corresponded until his death in 1974. The two men met for the first time in 1937. By that time, Eliade had compiled an impressive academic record that included a bachelor's degree in philosophy from the University of Bucharest and an M.A. and a Ph.D. in Sanskrit and Indian philosophy from the University of Calcutta. Evola … was already an accomplished writer and had published some of his most important works, such as *The Hermetic Tradition* (1931), *Revolt against the Modern World* (1934), and *The Mystery of the Grail* (1937).[31]

Eliade had read Evola's early philosophical works during the 1920s and "admired his intelligence and, even more, the density and clarity of his prose."[32] An intellectual friendship developed between the young Romanian scholar and the Italian philosopher, who was nine years Eliade's senior. Their common interest in yoga led Evola to write *L'uomo e la potenza* (Man as power) in 1926 (revised in 1949 with the new title *The Yoga of Power* [33]) and Eliade to write the acclaimed scholarly work *Yoga: Immortality and Freedom* (1933). As Eliade … recalls in his autobiographical journals:

> I received letters from him when I was in Calcutta (1928-31) in which he instantly begged me not to speak to him of yoga, or of "magical powers" except to report precise facts to which I had personally been a witness. In India I also received several publications from him, but I only remember a few issues of the journal *Krur*.[34]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Evola and Eliade's first meeting was in Romania, in conjunction with a luncheon hosted by the philosopher Nae Ionescu. Evola was traveling through Europe at the time, establishing contacts, and giving lectures "in the attempt to coordinate those elements who could represent, to some degree, the [T]raditional thought on the political-cultural plane."[35] Eliade recalled the admiration that Evola expressed for Corneliu Codreanu (1899-1938), the founder of the Romanian nationalist and Christian movement known as the "Iron Guard." Evola and Codreanu had met the morning of the luncheon. Codreanu told Evola of the effects that incarceration had had on his soul, and of his discovery of contemplation in the solitude and silence of his prison cell. In his autobiography Evola described Codreanu as "one of the worthiest and most spiritually oriented persons I ever met in the nationalist movements of that period."[36] Eliade wrote that at the luncheon "Evola was still dazzled by him [Codreanu]. I vaguely remember the remarks he made then on the disappearance of contemplative disciplines in the political battle of the West."[37] But the two scholars' focus was different indeed. As Eliade wrote in his journal:

> One day I received a rather bitter letter from him, in which he reproached me for never citing him, no more than did Guénon. I answered him as best as I could, and I must one day give reasons and explanations that that response called for. My argument could not have been simpler. The books I write are intended for today's audience, and not for initiates. Unlike Guénon and his emulators, I believe I have nothing to write that would be intended especially for them.[38]

I must conclude from Eliade's remarks that he did not like, share, or care for Evola's esoteric views and leanings. I believe there are three reasons for Eliade's aversion. First, Evola, like all traditionalists, presumed the existence of a higher, solar, royal, and esoteric primordial tradition, and devoted his life to describing, studying, and celebrating it in its many forms and varieties. He also set this tradition above and against what he dubbed "telluric" modern popular cultures and civilizations (such as Romania's, to which Eliade belonged). In *Revolt against the Modern World* one can read many instances of this juxtaposition.

Eliade, for his part, rejected any emphasis on esotericism, because he thought it had a reductive effect on the human spirit. Eliade claimed that to limit the value of European spiritual creations exclusively to their "esoteric meanings" repeated in reverse the reductionism of the materialistic approach adopted by Marx and Freud. Nor did he believe in the existence of a primordial tradition: "I was suspicious of its artificial, ahistorical character," he wrote.[39] Second, Eliade rejected the negative or pessimistic view of the world and the human condition that characterized Guénon's and Evola's thought. Unlike Evola, who believed in the ongoing "putrefaction" of contemporary Western culture, Eliade claimed:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> [T]o the extent that I believe in the creativity of the human spirit, I cannot despair: culture, even in a crepuscular era, is the only means of conveying certain values and of transmitting a certain spiritual message. In a new Noah's Ark, by means of which the spiritual creation of the West could be saved, it is not enough for René Guénon's *L'esotérisme de Dante* to be included; there must be also the poetic, historic, and philosophical understanding of *The Divine Comedy*.[40]

Finally, the socio-cultural milieu that Eliade celebrated was very different from the one favored by Evola. As India regained its independence, Eliade came to believe that Asia was about to re-enter history and world politics and that his own people, the Romanians, "could fulfill a definite role in the coming dialogue between the…. West, Asia and cultures of the archaic folk type."[41] He celebrated the peasant roots of Romanian culture as they promoted universalism and pluralism, rather than nationalism and provincialism. Eliade wrote:

> It seemed to me that I was beginning to discern elements of unity in all peasant cultures, from China and South-East Asia to the Mediterranean and Portugal. I was finding everywhere what I later called "cosmic religiosity": that is, the leading role played by symbols and images, the religious respect for earth and life, the belief that the sacred is manifested directly through the mystery of fecundity and cosmic repetition . . .[42]

These conclusions could not have been more diametrically opposed to Evola's views, especially as he formulated them in *Revolt against the Modern World*. According to the latter's doctrine, cosmic religiosity is an inferior and corrupt form of spirituality, or, as he called it, a "lunar spirituality" (the moon, unlike the sun, is not a source of light, and merely reflects the latter's light, as "lunar spirituality" is contingent upon God, the All, or upon any other metaphysical version of the Absolute) characterized by mystical abandonment.

In his yet untranslated autobiography, *Il cammino del cinabro* ("The cinnabar's journey"), Evola describes his spiritual and intellectual journey through alien landscapes: religious (Christianity, theism), philosophical (idealism, nihilism, realism), and political (democracy, Fascism, post-war Italy). For readers who are not familiar with Hermeticism, we may recall that cinnabar is a red metal representing rubedo, or redness, which is the third and final stage of one's inner transformation. Evola explains at the beginning of his autobiography: "My natural sense of detachment from what is human in regard to many things that, especially in the affective domain, are usually regarded as 'normal,' was manifested in me at a very tender age."[43]

AUTARKEIA

Various religions and philosophies regard the human condition as highly problematic, likening it to a disease and setting forth a cure. This disease is characterized by many features, including a certain spiritual "heaviness," or

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gravitational pull, drawing us "downwards." Humans are prisoners of meaningless daily routines; of pernicious habits developed over years, e.g., drinking, smoking, gambling, workaholism, and sexual addictions, in response to external pressures; of an intellectual and spiritual laziness that prevents us from developing our powers and becoming living, vibrant beings; and of inconstancy, as is often painfully obvious from our ever-renewed "New Year's resolutions." How often, when we commit ourselves to practice something on a daily basis over a period of time, does the day soon come that we forget, find an excuse to abandon our commitment, or simply quit! This is not merely inconsistency or a lack of perseverance on our part: it is a symptom of our inability to master ourselves and our lives.

Moreover, we are by nature unable to keep our minds focused on any object of meditation. We are easily distracted and bored. We spend our days talking about unimportant, meaningless details. Our conversations, for the most part, are not real dialogues, but rather exchanges of monologues.

We are busy at jobs we do not care about, and earning a living is our utmost concern. We feel bored, empty, and sexually frustrated by our own or our partners' inability to deliver peak performance. We want more: more money, more leisure, more "toys," and more fulfillment, of which we get too little, too seldom. We succumb to all sorts of indulgences and petty pleasures to soothe our dull and wounded consciousness. And yet all these things are merely symptoms of the real problem that besets the human condition. Our real problem is not that we are deficient beings, but that we don't know how to be, and don't desire to be, different. We embrace everyday life and call it "the real thing," slowly but inexorably suffocating the yearning for transcendence buried deep within us. In the end this proves to be our real undoing; we are not unlike smokers who, after being diagnosed with emphysema, keep on smoking to the bitter end. The problem is that we deny there is a problem. We are like a psychotic person who denies he is mentally ill, or like a sociopath who after committing a heinous crime insists that he really has a conscience, producing tears and remorse to prove it.

In the past, movements like Pythagoreanism, Gnosticism, Manichaeism, Mandaeanism, and medieval Catharism claimed that the problem beleaguering human beings is the body itself, or physical matter, to be precise. These movements held that the soul or spirit is kept prisoner inside the cage of matter, waiting to be freed. (Evola rejected this interpretation as unsophisticated and as the product of a feminine and telluric worldview.) Buddhism declared a "polluted" or "unenlightened mind" to be the real problem, developing in the course of the centuries a real science of the mind in an attempt to cure the disease at the roots. Christian theism identified the root of human suffering and evil in sin. As a remedy, Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy propose incorporation into the church through baptism and active

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

participation in her liturgical life. Many Protestants advocate, instead, a living and personal relationship with Jesus Christ as one's Lord and Savior, to be cultivated through prayer, Bible studies, and church fellowship.

Evola regarded acceptance of the human condition as the real problem, and autarchy, or self-sufficiency, as the cure. According to the ancient Cynics, *autarkeia* is the ability to lead a satisfactory, full life with the least amount of material goods and pleasures. An autarchic being (the ideal man) is a person who is able to grow spiritually even in the absence of what others consider the necessities of life (e.g., health, wealth, and good human relationships). The Stoics equated autarchy with virtue (*arête*, which they regarded as the only thing needed for happiness. Even the Epicureans, led though they were by a quest for pleasure, regarded autarkeia as a "great good, not with the aim of always getting by with little, but that if much is lacking, we may be satisfied with little."[44]

Evola endorsed the notion of *autarkeia* out of his rejection of the human condition and of the ordinary life that stems from it. Like Nietzsche before him, Evola claimed that the human condition and everyday life should not be embraced, but overcome: our worth lies in being a "project" (in Latin *projectum*, "to be cast forward"). Thus, what truly matters for human beings is not who we are but what we can and should become. Humans are enlightened or unenlightened according to whether or not they grasp this basic metaphysical truth. It was not snobbism that led Evola to conclude that most human beings are "slaves" trapped in samsara like guinea pigs running on a wheel inside their cage. According to Evola, sharing this state, among those one encounters each day, are not only persons with low paying jobs, but also one's coworkers, family members, and especially persons without a formal education. This is of course difficult to acknowledge. Evola was consumed by a yearning for what the Germans call *mehr als leben* ("more than living"), which is unavoidably frustrated by the contingencies of human existence. We read in a collection of Evola's essays on the subject of mountain climbing:

> At certain existential peaks, just as heat is transformed into light, life becomes free of itself; not in the sense of the death of individuality or some kind of mystical shipwreck, but in the sense of a transcendent affirmation of life, in which anxiety, endless craving, yearning and worrying, the quest for religious faith, human supports and goals, all give way to a dominating state of calm. There is something greater than life, within life itself, and not outside of it. This heroic experience is valuable and good in itself, whereas ordinary life is only driven by interests, external things and human conventions.[45]

According to Evola the human condition cannot and should not be embraced, but rather overcome. The cure does not consist in more money, more education, or moral uprightness, but in a radical and consistent commitment to pursue spiritual liberation. The past offers several examples of the distinction between an "ordinary" life and a "differentiated" life. The ancient Greeks

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

referred to ordinary, material, physical life by the term bios, and used the term zoe to describe spiritual life. Buddhist and Hindu scriptures drew a distinction between samsara, or the life of needs, cravings, passions, and desires, and nirvana, a state, condition or extinction of suffering (dukka). Christian scriptures distinguish between the "life according to the flesh" and the "life according to the Spirit." The Stoics distinguish between a "life according to nature" and a life dominated by passions. Heidegger distinguished between authentic and inauthentic life.

Kierkegaard talked about the aesthetic life and the ethical life. Zoroastrians distinguished between Good and Evil. The Essenes divided mankind into two groups: the followers of the Truth and the followers of the Lie.

The authors who first introduced Evola to the notions of self-sufficiency and of the "absolute individual" (an ideal, unattainable state) were Nietzsche and Carlo Michelstaedter. The latter was a twenty-three year old Jewish-Italian student who committed suicide in 1910, the day after completing his doctoral dissertation, which was first published in 1913 with the title *La persuasione e la retorica* (Persuasion and rhetoric).[46] In his thesis, Michelstaedter claims that the human condition is dominated by remorse, melancholy, boredom, fear, anger, and suffering. Man's actions reveal that he is a passive being. Because he attributes value to things, man is also distracted by them or by their pursuit. Thus man seeks outside himself a stable reference point, but fails to find it, remaining the unfortunate prisoner of his illusory individuality. The two possible ways to live the human condition, according to Michelstaedter, are the way of Persuasion and the way of Rhetoric. Persuasion is an unachievable goal. It consists in achieving possession of oneself totally and unconditionally, and in no longer needing anything else. This amounts to having life in one's self. In Michelstaedter's words:

> The way of Persuasion, unlike a bus route, does not have signs that can be read, studied and communicated to others. However, we all have within ourselves the need to find that; we all must blaze our own trail because each one of us is alone and cannot expect any help from the outside. The way of Persuasion has only this stipulation: do not settle for what has been given you.[47]

On the contrary, the way of Rhetoric designates the palliatives or substitutes that man adopts in lieu of an authentic Persuasion. According to Evola, the path of Rhetoric is followed by "those who spurn an actual self-possession, leaning on other things, seeking other people, trusting in others to deliver them, according to a dark necessity and a ceaseless and indefinite yearning."[48] As Nietzsche wrote:

> You crowd together with your neighbors and have beautiful words for it. But I tell you: Your love of your neighbor is your bad love of yourselves. You flee to your neighbor away from yourselves and would like to make a virtue of it: but I see

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> through your selflessness. . . . I wish rather that you could not endure to be with any kind of neighbor or with your neighbor's neighbor; then you would have to create your friend and his overflowing heart of yourselves.[49]

The goal of autarchy appears throughout Evola's works. In his quest for this privileged condition, he expounded the paths blazed by various movements in the past, such as Tantrism, Buddhism, Mithraism, and Hermeticism.

In the early 1920s, Decio Calvari, president of the Italian Independent Theosophical League, introduced Evola to the study of Tantrism. Soon Evola began a correspondence with the learned British orientalist and divulger of Tantrism, Sir John Woodroffe (who also wrote with the pseudonym of "Arthur Avalon"), whose works and translations of Tantric texts he amply utilized. While René Guénon celebrated Vedanta as the quintessence of Hindu wisdom in his *L'homme et son devenir selon le Vedanta* (Man and his becoming according to the Vedanta) (1925), upholding the primacy of contemplation or of knowledge over action, Evola adopted a different perspective. Rejecting the view that spiritual authority is worthier than royal power, Evola wrote *L'uomo come potenza* (Man as power) in 1925. In the third revised edition (1949), the title was changed to *Lo yoga della potenza* (The yoga of power).[50] This book represents a link between his philosophical works and the rest of his literary production, which focuses on Traditional concerns.

The thesis of *The Yoga of Power* is that the spiritual and social conditions that characterize the Kali-yuga greatly decrease the effectiveness of purely intellectual, contemplative, and ritual paths. In this age of decadence, the only way open to those who seek the "great liberation" is one of resolute action.[51] Tantrism defined itself as a system based on practice, in which hatha-yoga and kundalini-yoga constitute the psychological and mental training of the followers of Tantrism in their quest for liberation. While criticizing an old Western prejudice according to which Oriental spiritualities are characterized by an escapist attitude (as opposed to those of the West, which allegedly promote vitalism, activism, and the will to power), Evola reaffirmed his belief in the primacy of action by outlining the path followed in Tantrism. Several decades later, a renowned member of the French Academy, Marguerite Yourcenar, paid homage to *The Yoga of Power*. She wrote of "the immense benefit that a receptive reader may gain from an exposition such as Evola's,"[52] and concluded that "the study of *The Yoga of Power* is particularly beneficial in a time in which every form of discipline is naively discredited."[53]

But Evola's interest was not confined to yoga. In 1943 he wrote … *The Doctrine of the Awakening*, dealing with the teachings of early Buddhism. He regarded Buddha's original message as an Aryan ascetic path meant for spiritual "warriors" seeking liberation from the conditioned world. In this book he emphasized the anti-theistic and anti-monistic insights of Buddha. Buddha taught that devotion to this or that god or goddess, ritualism, and study of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vedas were not conducive to enlightenment, nor was experience of the identity of one's soul with the "cosmic All" named Brahman, since, according to Buddha, both "soul" and "Brahman" are figments of our deluded minds.

In *The Doctrine of the Awakening* Evola meticulously outlines the four "jhanas," or meditative stages, that are experienced by a serious practitioner on the path leading to nirvana. Most of the sources Evola drew from are … Italian and German translations of the *Sutta Pitaka*, that part of the ancient Pali canon of Buddhist scriptures in which Buddha's discourses are recorded. While extolling the purity and faithfulness of early Buddhism to Buddha's message, Evola characterized Mahayana Buddhism as a later deviation and corruption of Buddha's teachings, though he celebrated Zen[54] and the doctrine of emptiness (sunyata) as Mahayana's greatest achievements. In *The Doctrine of the Awakening* Evola extols the figure of the *ahrat*, one who has attained enlightenment. Such a person is free from the cycle of rebirth, having successfully overcome samsaric existence. The *ahrat*'s achievement, according to Evola, can be compared to that of the jivan-mukti of Tantrism, of the Mithraic initiate, of the Gnostic sage, and of the Taoist "immortal."

This text was one of Evola's finest. Partly as a result of reading it, two British members of the OSS became Buddhist monks. The first was H. G. Musson, who also translated Evola's book from Italian into English. The second was Osbert Moore, who became a distinguished scholar of Pali, translating a number of Buddhist texts into English. On a personal note, I would like to add that Evola's *Doctrine of Awakening* sparked my interest in Buddhism, leading me to read the *Sutta Pitaka*, to seek the company of Theravada monks, and to practice meditation.

In *The Metaphysics of Sex* (1958) Evola took issue with three views of human sexuality. The first is naturalism. According to naturalism the erotic life is conceived as an extension of animal instincts, or merely as a means to perpetuate the species. This view has recently been advocated by the anthropologist Desmond Morris, both in his books and in his documentary *The Human Animal*. The second view Evola called "bourgeois love": it is characterized by respectability and sanctified by marriage. The most important features of this type of sexuality are mutual commitment, love, feelings. The third view of sex is hedonism. Following this view, people seek pleasure as an end in itself. This type of sexuality is hopelessly closed to transcendent possibilities intrinsic to sexual intercourse, and thus not worthy of being pursued. Evola then went on to explain how sexual intercourse can become a path leading to spiritual achievements.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

APOLITEIA

In 1988 a passionate champion of free speech and democracy, the journalist and author I. F. Stone, wrote a provocative book entitled *The Trial of Socrates*. In his book Stone argued that Socrates, contrary to what Xenophon and Plato claimed in their accounts of the life of their beloved teacher, was not unjustly put to death by a corrupt and evil democratic regime. According to Stone, Socrates was guilty of several questionable attitudes that eventually brought about his own downfall.

First, Socrates personally refrained from, and discouraged others from pursuing, political involvement, in order to cultivate the "perfection of the soul." Stone finds this attitude reprehensible, since in a city all citizens have duties as well as rights. By failing to live up to his civic responsibilities, Socrates was guilty of "civic bankruptcy," especially during the dictatorship of the Thirty. At that time, instead of joining the opposition, Socrates maintained a passive attitude: "The most talkative man in Athens fell silent when his voice was most needed."[55]

Next, Socrates idealized Sparta, had aristocratic and pro-monarchical views, and despised Athenian democracy, spending a great deal of time in denigrating the common man. Finally, Socrates might have been acquitted if only he had not antagonized his jury with his amused condescension and invoked the principle of free speech instead.

Evola resembles Socrates in the attitudes toward politics described by Stone. Evola too professed "*apoliteia*."[56] He discouraged people from passionate involvement in politics. He was never a member of a political party, refraining even from joining the Fascist party during its years in power. Because of that he was turned down when he tried to enlist in the army at the outbreak of the World War II, although he had volunteered to serve on the front. He also discouraged participation in the "agoric life." The ancient agora, or public square, was the place where free Athenians gathered to discuss politics, strike business deals, and cultivate social relationships. As Buddha said:

> Indeed Ananda, it is not possible that a bikkhu [monk] who delights in company, who delights in society will ever enter upon and abide in either the deliverance of the mind that is temporary and delectable or in the deliverance of the mind that is perpetual and unshakeable. But it can be expected that when a bikkhu lives alone, withdrawn from society, he will enter upon and abide in the deliverance of mind that is temporal and delectable or in the deliverance of mind that is perpetual and unshakeable . . . .[57]

Like Socrates, Evola celebrated the civic values, the spiritual and political achievements, and the metaphysical worth of ancient monarchies, warrior aristocracies, and traditional, non-democratic civilizations. He had nothing but contempt for the ignorance of ordinary people, for the rebellious masses, for the insignificant common man.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Finally, like Socrates, Evola never appealed to such democratic values as "human rights," "freedom of speech," and "equality," and was "sentenced" to what the Germans call "death by silence." In other words, he was relegated to academic oblivion.

Evola's rejection of involvement in the socio-political arena must also be attributed to his philosophy of inequality. Norberto Bobbio, an Italian senator and professor emeritus of the philosophy department of the University of Turin, has written a small book entitled *Right and Left: The Significance of a Political Distinction*.[58] In it Bobbio, a committed leftist intellectual, attempts to identify the key element that differentiates the political Right from the Left (a dyad rendered in the non-ideological American political arena by the dichotomy "conservatives and liberal," or "mainstream and extremist"). After discussing several objections to the contemporary relevance of the Right-Left dyad following the decline and fall of the major political ideologies, Bobbio concludes that the juxtaposition of Right and Left is still a legitimate and viable one, though one day it will run its course, like other famous dyads of the past: "patricians and plebeians" in ancient Rome, "Guelphs and Ghibellines" during the Middle Ages, and "Crown and Parliament" in seventeenth century England.

At the end of his book Bobbio suggests that, "the main criterion to distinguish between Right and Left is the different attitude they have toward the ideal of equality."[59]

Thus, according to Bobbio, the views of Right and Left on "liberty" and "brotherhood" (the other two values in the French revolutionary trio) are not as discordant as their positions on equality. Bobbio explains:

> We may properly call "egalitarians" those who, while being aware that human beings are both equal and unequal, give more relevance, when judging them and recognizing their rights and duties, to that which makes them equal rather than to what makes them un-equal; and "inegalitarians," those who, starting from the same premise, give more importance to what makes them unequal rather than to what makes them equal.[60]

Evola, as a representative of the European Right, may be regarded as one of the leading antiegalitarian philosophers of the twentieth century. Evola's arguments transcend the age-old debate between those who claim that class, racial, educational, and gender differences between people are due to society's structural injustices, and those who, on the other hand, believe that these differences are genetic. According to Evola there are spiritual and ontological reasons that account for differences in people's lot in life. In Evola's writings the social dichotomy is between initiates and "higher beings" on the one hand, and hoi polloi on the other.

The two works that best express Evola's apoliteia are *Men among Ruins* (1953) and *Riding the Tiger* (1961). In the former he expounds his views on the "organic" State, lamenting the emerging primacy of economics over politics in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

post-war Europe and America. Evola wrote this book to supply a point of reference for those who, having survived the war, did not hesitate to regard themselves as "reactionaries" deeply hostile to the emerging subversive intellectual and political forces that were re-shaping Europe:

Again, we can see that the various facets of the contemporary social and political chaos are interrelated and that it is impossible to effectively contrast them other than by returning to the origins. To go back to the origins means, plain and simple, to reject everything that, in every domain, whether social, political and economic, is connected to the "immortal principles" of 1789 in the guise of libertarian, individualistic and egalitarian thought, and to oppose to it a hierarchical view. It is only in the context of such a view that the value and freedom of man as a person are not mere words or pretexts for a work of destruction and subversion.[61]

Evola encourages his readers to remain passive spectators in the ongoing process of Europe's reconstruction, and to seek their citizenship elsewhere:

> The Idea, only the Idea must be our true homeland. It is not being born in the same country, speaking the same language or belonging to the same racial stock that matters; rather, sharing the same Idea must be the factor that unites us and differentiates us from everybody else.[62]

In *Riding the Tiger*, Evola outlines intellectual and existential strategies for coping with the modern world without being affected by it. The title is borrowed from a Chinese saying, and it suggests that a way to prevent a tiger from devouring us is to jump on its back and ride it without being thrown off. Evola argued that lack of involvement in the political and social construction of the human polis on the part of the "differentiated man" can be accompanied by a sense of sympathy toward those who, in various ways, live on the fringe of society, rejecting its dogmas and conventions.

> The "differentiated person" feels like an outsider in this society and feels no moral obligation toward society's request that he joins what he regards as an absurd system. Such a person can understand not only those who live outside society's parameters, but even those who are set against such (a) society, or better, this society.[63]

This is why, in his 1968 book *L'arco e la clava* (The bow and the club), Evola expressed some appreciation for the "beat generation" and the hippies, all the while arguing that they lacked a proper sense of transcendence as well as firm points of spiritual reference from which they could launch an effective inner, spiritual "revolt" against society.

Guido Stucco has an M.A. in Systematic Theology at Seaton Hall and a Ph.D. in Historical Theology at St. Louis University. He has translated five of Evola's books into English.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

End Notes

1. For a good introduction to this movement and its ideas, William Quinn, *The Only Tradition,* Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997.

2. The first of the Theosophical Society's three declared objectives was to promote the brotherhood of all men, regardless of race, creed, nationality, and caste.

3. Tomislav Sunic, *Against Democracy and Equality: The European New Right,* New York: Peter Lang, 1991; Ian B. Warren's interview with Alain de Benoist, "The European New Right: Defining and Defending Europe's Heritage," *The Journal of Historical Review,* Vol. 13, no. 2, March-April 1994, pp. 28-37; and the special issue "The French New Right," *Telos,* Winter 1993-Spring 1994.

4. Martin Lee, *The Beast Reawakens*, Boston: Little, Brown, 1997.

5. Walter Laqueur, *Fascism: Past, Present, Future,* New York: Oxford University Press, 1996, pp. 97-98. Despite his bad press in the U.S., Evola's works have been favorably reviewed by Joscelyn Godwin, "Evola: Prophet against Modernity," *Gnosis Magazine*, Summer 1996, pp. 64-65; and by Robin Waterfield, "Baron Julius Evola and the Hermetic Tradition," *Gnosis Magazine,* Winter 1990, pp. 12-17.

6. The first to write about Evola in this country was Thomas Sheehan, in "Myth and Violence: The Fascism of Julius Evola and Alain de Benoist," *Social Research*, Vol. 48, Spring 1981, pp. 45-73. See also Richard Drake, "Julius Evola and the Ideological Origins of the Radical Right in Contemporary Italy," in Peter Merkl (ed.), *Political Violence and Terror: Motifs and Motivations*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986, pp. 61-89; "Julius Evola, Radical Fascism, and the Lateran Accords," *The Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. 74, 1988, pp. 403-19; and the chapter "The Children of the Sun," in *The Revolutionary Mystique and Terrorism in Contemporary Italy,* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989, pp. 116-134.

7. Philip Rees, in his *Biographical Dictionary of the Extreme Right since 1890*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1991, devotes a meager page and a half to Evola, and shamelessly concludes, without adducing a shred of evidence, that "… Evolian-inspired violence result[ed] in the Bologna station bombing of 2 August 1980." Gianfranco De Turris, president of the Julius Evola Foundation in Rome and one of the leading Evola scholars, suggested that, in Evola's case, rather than "bad teacher" one ought to talk about "bad pupils." See his *Elogio e difesa di Julius Evola: il barone e i terroristi*, Rome: Edizioni Mediterranee, 1997, in which he debunks the unfounded charge that Evola was responsible either directly or indirectly for acts of terrorism committed in Italy.

8. See for instance Sheehan's convoluted article "Diventare Dio: Julius Evola and the Metaphysics of Fascism," *Stanford Italian Review*, Vol. 6, 1986, pp. 279-92, in which he tries to demonstrate that Nietzsche and Evola mirror each other. Sheehan should have rather spoken of an overcoming of Nietzsche's philosophy on the part of Evola. The latter rejected Nietzsche's notion of "Eternal Recurrence" as "nothing more than a myth"; his vitalism, because closed to transcendence and hopelessly immanentist; his "Will to Power" because: "Power in itself is amorphous and meaningless if it lacks the foundation of a given being, of an inner direction, of an essential unity" (Julius Evola, *Cavalcare la tigre* [Riding the tiger], Milan: Vanni Scheiwiller, 1971, p. 49); and, finally, Nietzsche's nihilism, which Evola denounced as a project that had been implemented half-way.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

9. H.T. Hansen, a pseudonym adopted by T. Hakl, is an Austrian scholar who earned a law degree in 1970. He is a partner in the prestigious Swiss publishing house Ansata Verlag and one of the leading Evola scholars in German-speaking countries. Hakl has translated several works by Evola into German and supplied lengthy scholarly introductions to most of them.

10. See for instance the topics of a conference held in France on the occasion of the centenary of his birth: "Julius Evola 1898-1998: Eveil, destin et expériences de terres spirituelles," on the web site http://perso.wanadoo.fr/collectif.ea/langues/anglais/acteesf.htm.

11. Marcello Veneziani, *Julius Evola tra filosofia e tradizione*, Rome: Ciarrapico Editore, 1984, p. 110.

12. This work has been translated into French and German. My translation of the first volume is scheduled to be published in December 2002 by Inner Traditions, with the title *Introduction to Magic: Rituals and Practical Techniques for the Magus*.

13. Marco Rossi, a leading Italian authority on Evola, wrote an article on Evola's alleged antidemocratic anti-Fascism in *Storia contemporanea*, Vol. 20, 1989, pp. 5-42.

14. Julius Evola, *Il cammino del cinabro,* Milan: Vanni Scheiwiller, 1972, p. 162.

15. Julius Evola, *Etica aria*, Arian ethics, Rome: Europa srl, 1987, p. 28.

16. When Evola and a few friends came to the realization that the war was lost for the Axis, they began to draft plans for the creation of a "Movement for the Rebirth of Italy." This movement was supposed to organize a right-wing political party capable of stemming the post-war influence of the Left. Nothing came of it, though.

17. Julius Evola, *Il Cammino del cinabro*, p. 183.

18. Julius Evola, *Etica aria*, p. 24.

19. In the beginning of his autobiography Evola claimed that reading Nietzsche fostered his opposition to Christianity, a religion which never appealed to him. He felt theories of sin and redemption, divine love, and grace as "foreign" to his spirit.

20. Rebora was imprecisely quoting from memory a saying by Jesus found in John 7:37. The exact quote is "Let anyone who is thirsty come to me, and let the one who believes in me drink." (Revised Standard Version.)

21. Julius Evola, *Lettere di Julius Evola a Girolamo Comi, 1934-1962*, Rome: Fondazione Julius Evola, 1987, p. 17. In 1922 Evola was on the brink of suicide. He had experimented with hallucinogenic drugs and was consumed by an intense desire for extinction. In a letter dated July 2, 1921, Evola wrote to his friend Tristan Tzara: "I am in such a state of inner exhaustion that even thinking and holding a pen requires an effort which I am not often capable of. I live in a state of atony and of immobile stupor, in which every activity and act of the will freeze.... Every action repulses me. I endure these feelings like a disease. Also, I am terrified at the thought of time ahead of me, which I do not know how to utilize. In all things I perceive a process of decomposition, as things collapse inwardly, turning into wind and sand." *Lettere di Julius Evola a Tristan Tzara, 1919-1923*, Rome: Julius Evola Foundation, 1991, p. 40. Evola was able to overcome this crisis after reading the Italian translation of the Buddhist text Majjhima-Nikayo, the so-called "middle length discourses of the Buddha." In one of his discourses Buddha taught the importance of detachment from one's sensory perceptions and feelings, including one's yearning for personal extinction.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

22. For a brief account of their correspondence, see Julius Evola, *René Guénon: A Teacher for Modern Times*, trans. by Guido Stucco, Edmonds, WA: Holmes Publishing Group, 1994.
23. Joscelyn Godwin, *Arktos: The Polar Myth in Science, Symbolism, and Nazi Survival*, Grand Rapids, MI: Phanes Press, 1993, p. 61.
24. In two letters to Comi, Evola wrote: "From a spiritual point of view my situation doesn't mean more to me than a flat tire on my car"; and: "The small matter of my legs' condition has only put some limitations on some profane activities, while on the intellectual and spiritual planes I am still following the same path and upholding the same views," *Lettere a Comi*, pp. 18, 27.
25. *The Middle Length Sayings*, vol. III, trans. by I.B. Horner, London: Pali Text Society, 1959, p. 278.
26. Julius Evola, *Cavalcare la tigre*, p. 175.
27. Yuri Stoyanov, *The Hidden Tradition in Europe*, New York: Penguin, 1994, p. 8.
28. The Latin word hostis means both "guest" and "enemy." This is revealing of how ancient Romans regarded foreigners in general.
29. Julius Evola, *Revolt against the Modern World*, Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions, 1995, p. 6. The first part of the book deals with the concepts noted in the extract cited. The second part of the book deals with the modern world.
30. Ibid.
31. All of these works have been translated and published in English by Inner Traditions.
32. Mircea Eliade, *Exile's Odyssey*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988, p. 152.
33. Julius Evola, *The Yoga of Power*, trans. by Guido Stucco, Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions, 1992.
34. Mircea Eliade, *Journal III, 1970-78,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989, p. 161.
35. Julius Evola, *Il cammino del cinabro*, p. 139.
36. Ibid.
37. Eliade, *Journal III, 1970-78,* p. 162.
38. Ibid., pp. 162-63.
39. Mircea Eliade, *Exile's Odyssey*, pp. 152. See also Alain de Benoist and quote him at length.
40. Ibid. This criticism was reiterated by S. Nasr in an interview to the periodical *Gnosis*.
41. Mircea Eliade, *Journey East, Journey West,* San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1981-88, p. 204.
42. Eliade, *Journey East, Journey West,* p. 202.
43. Evola, *Il cammino del cinabro*, p. 12.
44. Epicurus, *Letter to Menoeceus*, p. 47.
45. Julius Evola, *Meditations on the Peaks*, trans. by Guido Stucco, Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions, 1998, p. 5.
46. Carlo Michelstaedter, *La persuasione e la retorica*, Milan: Adelphi Edizioni, 1990.
47. Ibid., p. 104.
48. *Il cammino del cinabro*, p. 46.
49. F. Nietzsche, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, trans. by R.J. Hollingdale, London: Penguin Books, 1969, p. 86.
50. Evola, *The Yoga of Power*, trans. by Guido Stucco, Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions, 1992.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

51. Evola would probably have liked Jesus' saying (Luke 16:16): "The law and the prophets lasted until John; but from then on the kingdom of God is proclaimed and everyone who enters does so with violence."

52. Marguerite Yourcenar, *Le temps, ce grand sculpteur*, Paris: Gallimard, 1983, p. 201.

53. Ibid., p. 204.

54. Julius Evola, *The Doctrine of Awakening*, Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions, 1995.

55. I. F. Stone, *The Trial of Socrates,* New York: Doubleday, 1988, p. 146.

56. Julius Evola, *Cavalcare la tigre*, pp. 174-78.

57. Mahajjima Nikayo, p. 122.

58. Norberto Bobbio, *Destra e sinistra: ragioni e significati di una distinzione politica*, Rome: Donzelli Editore, 1994. This book has been published in English as *Left and Right: The Significance of a Political Distinction,* Cambridge, England: Polity Press, 1996.

59. Ibid., p. 80.

60. Ibid., p. 74.

61. Julius Evola, *Gli uomini e le rovine*, Rome: Edizioni Settimo Sigillo, 1990, p. 64.

62. Ibid., p. 41.

63. Julius Evola, *Cavalcare la tigre*, p. 179.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hereditary Talent and Character

Sir Francis Galton

The following two-part essay by Sir Francis Galton originally appeared as two separate installments in ***MacMillan's Magazine*** *during the mid-1800s. It appeared five years after Galton's cousin, Charles Darwin, published his landmark theory of natural selection,* ***The Origins of Species****. Galton's insightful demeanor and investigative curiosity are readily apparent in what would form the basis of his influential study* ***Hereditary Genius****, first published in 1869. According to Ruth Schwartz Cowan's 1969 dissertation,* ***Sir Francis Galton and the Study of Heredity in the Nineteenth Century****, Galton's two-part essay was his "first paper on the subject of heredity."* In his autobiography and final book,* ***Memories of My Life****, Galton reflected on how well this essay held up over time, considering it was written when he was 42 years old. As part of our occasional Classics Corner series, the full text of this two-part essay is reproduced below.*

Part I

The power of man over animal life, in producing whatever varieties of form he pleases, is enormously great. It would seem as though the physical structure of future generations was almost as plastic as clay, under the control of the breeder's will. It is my desire to show, more pointedly than—so far as I am aware—has been attempted before, that mental qualities are equally under control.

A remarkable misapprehension appears to be current as to the fact of the transmission of talent by inheritance. It is commonly asserted that the children of eminent men are stupid; that, where great power of intellect seems to have been inherited, it has descended through the mother's side; and that one son commonly runs away with the talent of a whole family. My own inquiries have led me to a diametrically opposite conclusion. I find that talent is transmitted by inheritance in a very remarkable degree; that the mother has by no means the monopoly of its transmission; and that whole families of persons of talent are more common than those in which one member only is possessed of it. I justify my conclusions by the statistics I now proceed to adduce, which I believe are amply sufficient to command conviction. They are only a part of much material I have collected, for a future volume on this subject; all of which points in the same direction. I should be very grateful to any of my readers for information that may help me in my further inquiries.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In investigating the hereditary transmission of talent, we must ever bear in mind our ignorance of the laws which govern the inheritance even of physical features. We know to a certainty that the latter exist, though we do not thoroughly understand their action. The breeders of our domestic animals have discovered many rules by experience, and act upon them to a nicety. But we have not advanced, even to this limited extent, in respect to the human race. It has been nobody's business to study them; and the study is difficult, for many reasons. Thus, only two generations are likely to be born during the life of any observer; clothing conceals the shape; and each individual rarely marries more than once. Nevertheless, all analogy assures us that the physical features of man are equally transmissible with those of brutes! The resemblances between parent and offspring, as they appear to a casual observer, are just as close in one case as in the other; and, therefore, as a nearer scrutiny has established strict laws of hereditary transmission in brutes, we have every reason for believing that the same could also be discovered in the case of man.

So far as I am aware, no animals have ever been bred for general intelligence. Special aptitudes are thoroughly controlled by the breeder. He breeds dogs that point, retrieve, that fondle, or that bite; but no one has ever yet attempted to breed for high general intellect, irrespective of all other qualities. It would be a most interesting subject for an attempt. We hear constantly of prodigies of dogs, whose very intelligence makes them of little value as slaves. When they are wanted, they are apt to be absent on their own errands. They are too critical of their master's conduct. For instance, an intelligent dog shows marked contempt for an unsuccessful sportsman. He will follow nobody along a road that leads on a well-known tedious errand. He does not readily forgive a man who wounds his self-esteem. He is often a dexterous thief and a sad hypocrite. For these reasons an over-intelligent dog is not an object of particular desire, and therefore, I suppose, no one has ever thought of encouraging a breed of wise dogs. But it would be a most interesting occupation for a country philosopher to pick up the cleverest dogs he could hear of, and mate them together, generation after generation—breeding purely for intellectual power, and disregarding shape, size, and every other quality.

As no experiment of this description has ever been made, I cannot appeal to its success. I can only say that the general resemblances in mental qualities between parents and offspring, in man and brute, are every whit as near as the resemblance of their physical features; and I must leave the existence of actual laws in the former case to be a matter of inference from the analogy of the latter. Resemblance frequently fails where we might have expected it to hold; but we may fairly ascribe the failure to the influence of conditions that we do not yet comprehend. So long as we have a plenitude of evidence in favor of the hypothesis of the hereditary descent of talent, we need not be disconcerted when negative evidence is brought against us. We must reply that just the same argument might have been urged against the transmission of the physical

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

features of our domestic animals; yet our breeders have discovered certain rules, and make their living by acting upon them. They know, with accurate prevision, when particular types of animals are mated together, what will be the character of the offspring. They can say that such and such qualities will be reproduced to a certainty. That others are doubtful; for they may appear in some of the descendants and not in the rest. Lastly, that there are yet other qualities, excessive in one parent and defective in the other, that will be counterbalanced and be transmitted to the offspring in a moderate proportion.

I maintain by analogy that this prevision could be equally attained in respect to the mental qualities, though I cannot prove it. All I can show is that talent and peculiarities of character are found in the children, when they have existed in either of the parents, to an extent beyond all question greater than in the children of ordinary persons. It is a fact, neither to be denied nor to be considered of importance, that the children of men of genius are frequently of mediocre intellect. The qualities of each individual are due to the combined influence of his two parents; and the remarkable qualities of the one may have been neutralized in the offspring, by the opposite or defective qualities of the other. It is natural that contrast of qualities, in the parents' dispositions, should occur as frequently as harmony; for one of the many foundations of friendship and of the marriage union is a difference of character; each individual seeking thereby to supplement the qualities in which he feels his own nature to be deficient. We have also good reason to believe that every special talent or character depends on a variety of obscure conditions, the analysis of which has never yet been seriously attempted. It is easy to conceive that the entire character might be considerably altered, owing to the modification of any one of these conditions.

As a first step in my investigation, I sought a biographical work, of manageable size, that should contain the lives of the chief men of genius whom the world is known to have produced. I ultimately selected that of Sir Thomas Phillips, in his well-known work of reference, 'The Million of Facts,' because it is compiled with evident discrimination, and without the slightest regard to the question on which I was engaged. It is, moreover, prefaced, 'It has been attempted to record, in brief, only the ORIGINAL MINDS, who founded or originated. Biography in general is filled with mere imitators, or with men noted only for chance of birth, or necessary position in society.' I do not mean to say that Sir Thomas Phillips's selection is the best that could have been made, for he was a somewhat crotchety writer. It did not, however, much matter whose biography I adopted, so long as it had been written in the abovementioned spirit, and so long as I determined to abide steadfastly within its limits, without yielding to the temptation of supplying obvious omissions, in a way favorable to any provisional theory.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

According to this select biography, I find that 605 notabilities lived between the years 1453 and 1853. And among these are no less than 102 relationships, or 1 in 6.

It will be observed that the number is swelled by four large families, such as those of Gronovius and Stephens, of six members each, and of the Medici and the House of Orange, of four members each. The two first might be objected to, as hardly worthy of the distinguished place they occupy. But we must adhere to our biography; there are many more relationships that could very fairly have been added, as a set-off against these names. Such are two more Vanderweldes, and the family of Richelieu; besides others, like Hallam the historian, and Watt the mechanic, whose sons died early, full of the highest promise. Even if sixteen names were struck out of our list, the proportion of the relationship would remain as 86/605, or 1 in 7. And these are almost wholly referable to transmission of talent through the male line; for eminent mothers do not find a place in mere biographical lists. The overwhelming force of a statistical fact like this renders counter-arguments of no substantial effect.

Next, let us examine a biographical list of much greater extension. I have selected for this purpose an excellent brief dictionary by Mr C. Hone. It is not yet published, but part of its proof sheets have been obligingly lent to me. The entire work appears to contain some 19,000 names; it is, therefore, more than thirty times as extensive as the list we have hitherto been considering. I have selected one part only of this long series of names for examination, namely, those that begin with the letter M. There are 1141 names that remain under this letter, after eliminating those of sovereigns, and also of all persons who died before A.D. 1453. Out of these, 103, or 1 in 11, are either fathers and sons, or brothers; and I am by no means sure that I have succeeded in hunting out all the relationships that might be found to exist among them.

It will be remarked that the proportion of distinguished relationships becomes smaller, as we relax the restrictions of our selection; and it is reasonable that it should be so, for we then include in our lists the names of men who have been inducted into history through other conditions than the possession of eminent talent.

Again, if we examine into the relationships of the notabilities of the present day, we obtain even larger proportions. Walford's 'Men of the Time' contains an account of the distinguished men of England, the Continent, and America, who are now alive. Under the letter A there are 85 names of men, and no less than 25 of these, or 1 in three and a half, have relatives also in the list; 12 of them are brothers, and 11 fathers and sons.

Abbott, Rev. Jacob (U.S.A.), author on religious and moral subjects.

Abbott, Rev. John, younger *brother* of above, author on religious and moral subjects.

A'Beckett, Sir William, author, Solicitor-Gen. of New South Wales, and *brother* of late Gilbert Abbott A'Beckett.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Adam, Jean Victor, painter, *son* of an eminent engraver.

Adams, American minister, *son* of John Quincey Adams.

Ainsworth, William Francis, editor of *Journal of Natural and Geographical Science*, *Explorations in Asia Minor and Kurdistan*.

Ainsworth, William Harrison, novelist, *cousin* of above.

Aïïvazooski, Gabriel, Armenian, born in the Crimea, Professor of European and Oriental languages, and member of Historical Institute of France.

Aïïvazooski, Ivan, a marine painter, *brother* of above.

Albermarle, Earl of (*brother* Kepel). Albert, Prince (*brother*).

Aldis, Sir Charles, medical. Aldis, Charles J.B. medical, *son* of above.

Alexander, James Waddell, American divine (*son* of a Professor).

Alexander, Joseph Addison, Professor of Ancient languages, and of Biblical and Ecclesiastical history, *brother* of the above.

Alison, Sir Archibald, historian, *son* of author of *Essays on Taste*, his mother belonged to 'a family which has for two centuries been eminent in mathematics and the exact sciences.'

Ampère, member of French Academy, and Professor in College of France (literary), *son* of the celebrated physicist of the same name.

Arago, Etienne, journalist and theatrical writer, *brother* of the celebrated philosopher.

Argyropopulo, statesman, *son* of grand interpreter to the Porte.

Aristarchi, ecclesiastic and statesman, *son* of grand interpreter to the Porte.

Arnold, Matthew, *son* of late Dr Arnold.

Arwidson, Librarian R. Library, Stockholm, author, *son* of a person who held a high position in the Church.

Ashburton, Lord, *son* of Rt Hon. Alexander Baring.

Azeglio, Massimo, statesman and painter.

Azeglio, Marquis, *nephew* of above, diplomatist and painter.

So if we examine the biographies of artists. In Bryan's large *Dictionary of Painters*, the letter A contains 391 names of men, of whom 65 are near relatives, or 1 in 6: 33 of them are fathers and sons, 30 are brothers. In Fétis *Biographie Universelle des Musiciens,* the letter A contains 515 names, of which 50 are near relations, or 1 in 10. Two-thirds are fathers and sons, one-third are brothers.

It is justly to be urged, in limitation of the enormous effect of hereditary influence, implied by the above figures, that when a parent has achieved great eminence, his son will be placed in a more favorable position for advancement, than if he had been the son of an ordinary person. Social position is an especially important aid to success in statesmanship and generalship; for it is notorious that neither the Legislature nor the army afford, in their highest ranks, an open arena to the ablest intellects. The sons of the favored classes are introduced early in life to both these fields of trial, with every encouragement to support them. Those of the lower classes are delayed and discouraged in their start; and when

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they are near the coveted goal, they find themselves aged. They are too late: they are not beaten by the superior merit of their contemporaries, but by time; as was once touchingly remarked by Sir De Lacy Evans.

In order to test the value of hereditary influence with greater precision, we should therefore extract from our biographical list the names (they are 330) of those that have achieved distinction in the more open fields of science and literature. There is no favor here beyond the advantage of a good education. Whatever spur may be given by the desire to maintain the family fame, and whatever opportunities are afforded by abundant leisure, are more than neutralized by those influences which commonly lead the heirs of fortune to idleness and dilettantism.

Recurring to our list, we find fifty-one literary men who have distinguished relations. Therefore, no less than 51/605, or one distinguished man in every twelve, has a father, son, or brother, distinguished in literature. To take a round number at a venture, we may be sure that there have been far more than a million students educated in Europe during the last four centuries, being an average of only 2500 in each a year. According to our list, about 330 of these, or only 1 in 3000, achieved eminent distinction: yet of those who did so, 1 in 12 was related to a distinguished man. Keeping to literature alone, it is 51 to 330=1 to six and a half, that a very distinguished literary man has a very distinguished literary relative, and it is (leaving out the Gronovius and Stephenses) 20 to 330=1 to 16, and 12 to 330=1 to 28, that the relationship is father and son, or brother and brother, respectively.

The Law is, by far, the most open to fair competition of all the professions; and of all offices in the law there is none that is more surely the reward of the most distinguished intellectual capacity than that of the Lord Chancellor. It therefore becomes an exceedingly interesting question to learn what have been the relationships of our Lord Chancellors. Are they to any notable degree the children, or the parents, or the brothers of very eminent men? Lord Campbell's *Lives of the Chancellors* forms a valuable biographical dictionary for the purpose of this investigation. I have taken it just as it stands; including, as Lord Campbell does, certain Lord Keepers and Commissioners of the Great Seal, as of equal rank with the Chancellors. I may further mention, that many expressions in Lord Campbell's works show that he was a disbeliever in hereditary influence.

Now what are the facts? Since Henry VIII's time, when Chancellors ceased to be ecclesiastics, and were capable of marrying, we have had thirty-nine Chancellors, etc., whose lives have been written by Lord Campbell, or whom the following had eminent relationships:

Sir Nicholas Bacon, Lord Keeper: son, Lord Chancellor Bacon.

Coventry: son of a very learned judge of the Common Pleas.

Bacon: father as above.

Littleton: son of a judge.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Whitelock: son of a judge, father of two sons, one of great eminence as a lawyer, the other as a soldier.

Herbert: three sons. One had high command in army; the second, the great naval officer, created Lord Torrington; the third, Chief Justice of Queen's Bench.

Finch, son of Speaker of House of Commons, and first cousin to the Lord Chancellor Finch of previous years, had a son who 'almost rivalled his father,' and who was made Solicitor-General and Earl of Aylesford.

Macclesfield: son, President of Royal Society.

Talbot: father was bishop, consecutively, of Oxford, Salisbury, and Durham; had sons, of one of whom there were great hopes, but he died young; the other 'succeeded to his father's virtues.'

Hardwick had five sons, all very distinguished. One, a man of letters; second, Lord Chancellor Yorke; third, an ambassador; fourth, 'talented as the others'; fifth, Bishop of Ely.

Northington: father was 'one of the most accomplished men of his day.'

Pratt: father was Chief Justice of King's Bench; his son was distinguished for public service.

Yorke: father was Lord Chancellor Hardwicke. (*See* above.)

Bathurst: father was the Lord Bathurst of Queen Anne's time; his son was the Lord Bathurst who filled high office under George III and IV.

Erskine: his brothers were nearly as eminent. The whole family was most talented.

Eldon: brother was the famous Lord Stowell, Judge of Admiralty.

Thus out of the 39 Chancellors 16 had kinsmen of eminence. 13 of them—viz. Sir Nicholas Bacon, Lord Bacon, Coventry, Littleton, Whitelock, Herbert, Finch, Hardwick, Pratt, Yorke, Bathurst, Erskine, and Eldon—had kinsmen of great eminence. In other words, 13 out of 39—that is, 1 in every 3—are remarkable instances of hereditary influence.

It is astonishing to remark the number of the Chancellors, who rose from mediocre social positions, showing how talent makes its way at the Bar, and how utterly insufficient are favoritism and special opportunities to win the great legal prize of the Chancellorship. It is not possible accurately, and it is hardly worth while roughly, to calculate the numerical value of hereditary influence in obtaining the Chancellorship. It is sufficient to say that it is enormous. We must not only reckon the number of students actually at the Chancery bar, and say that the Lord Chancellor was the foremost man among them, but we must reckon the immense number of schools in England, in any one of which, if a boy shows real marks of eminence, he is pretty sure to be patronized and passed on to a better place of education; whence by exhibitions, and subsequently by University scholarships and fellowships, he may become educated as a lawyer. I believe, from these reasons, that the chances of the son of a Lord Chancellor to be himself also a Chancellor, supposing he enters the law, to be more than a thousandfold greater than if he were the son of equally

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rich but otherwise undistinguished parents. It does not appear an accident that, out of 54 Lord Chancellors or Lord Keepers, two—viz. Sir Nicholas Bacon and Lord Hardwick—should have had sons who were also Chancellors, when we bear in mind the very eminent legal relationships of Herbert, Finch, Eldon, and the rest.

The intellectual force of English boys has, up to almost the present date, been steadily directed to classical education. Classics form the basis of instruction at our grammar schools, so that every boy who possesses signal classical aptitudes has a chance of showing them. Those who are successful obtain exhibitions and other help, and ultimately find their way to the great arena of competition of University life.

The senior classic at Cambridge is not only the foremost of the 300 youths who take their degrees in the same year, but he is the foremost of perhaps a tenth part of the classical intellect of his generation, throughout all England. No industry, without eminent natural talent to back it, could possibly raise a youth into that position.

The institution of the class list at Cambridge dates from 1824; so there have been 41 senior classics up to the present year. Wherever two names had been bracketed together, I selected the one that stood best in other examinations, and then extracted the following names from the list of them, as instances of hereditary influence:

1827. Kennedy: father was a classic of eminence; two brothers, *see* below; another brother, almost equally distinguished in classics.

1828. Selwyn: brother M.P. for Cambridge, an eminent lawyer.

1830. Wordsworth nephew to the poet, brother of an almost equally distinguished classic, son of the Master of Trinity.

1831. Kennedy (*see* above).

1832. Lushington: brother (*see* below); nephew to the Right Hon. Sir Stephen Lushington. The family has numerous other members of eminent talent.

1834. Kennedy (*see* above).

1835. Goulbourn: father, Chancellor of Exchequer, nephew of Serjeant Goulbourn, cousin to Dr Goulbourn, Head Master of Rugby, the well-known preacher.

1835. Vaughan: many relationships like those of Goulbourn, including the Judge, the Professor at Oxford, and Mr Hawkins (*see* below).

1842. Denman: father was the eminent Chief Justice Lord Denman.

1846. Lushington: brother (*see* above).

1854. Hawkins: *see* Vaughan.

1855. Butler: son of Senior Wrangler of 1794; three brothers, of whom two held University Scholarships in Oxford, and the other was a double first-class man at Cambridge. 12 of the 41, or about 1 in three and a half, show these influences in a more or less marked degree; 7 of them, or 1 in 6, viz. 3 Kennedy, 1 Wordsworth, 2 Lushington, and 1 Butler, very much so.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Everywhere is the enormous power of hereditary influence forced on our attention. If we take a list of the most brilliant standard writers of the last few years, we shall find a large share of the number have distinguished relationships. It would be difficult to set off, against the following instances, the same number of names of men of equal eminence, whose immediate relatives were undistinguished. Brontë (Jane Eyre and her two sisters); Bulwer (and his brother the ambassador); Disraeli (father, author of *Curiosities of Literature*); Hallam (son, the subject of *In Memoriam*); Kingsley (two brothers eminent novelists, two others no less talented); Lord Macaulay (son of Zachary Macaulay); Miss Martineau (and her brother); Merivale, Herman and Charles (brothers); Dean Stanley (father the bishop, and popular writer on birds); Thackeray (daughter, authoress of *Elizabeth*); Tennyson (brother also a poet); Mrs Trollope (son, Anthony).

As we cannot doubt that the transmission of talent is as much through the side of the mother as through that of the father, how vastly would the offspring be improved, supposing distinguished women to be commonly married to distinguished men, generation after generation, their qualities being in harmony and not in contrast, according to rules, of which we are now ignorant, but which a study of the subject would be sure to evolve!

It has been said by Bacon that "great men have no continuance." I, however, find that very great men are certainly not averse to the other sex, for some such have been noted for their illicit intercourses, and, I believe, for a corresponding amount of illegitimate issue. Great lawyers are especially to be blamed in this, even more than poets, artists, or great commanders. It seems natural to believe that a person who is not married, or who, if married, does not happen to have children, should feel himself more vacant to the attractions of a public or a literary career than if he had the domestic cares and interests of a family to attend to. Thus, if we take a list of the leaders in science of the present day, the small number of them who have families is very remarkable. Perhaps the best selection of names we can make, is from those who have filled the annual scientific office of President of the British Association. We will take the list of the commoners simply, lest it should be objected, though unjustly, that some of the noblemen who have occupied the chair were not wholly indebted to their scientific attainments for that high position. Out of twenty-two individuals, about one-third have children; one-third are or have been married and have no children; and one-third have never been married. Among the children of those who have had families, the names of Frank Buckland and Alexander Herschel are already well-known to the public.

There has been a popular belief that men of great intellectual eminence, are usually of feeble constitution, and of a dry and cold disposition. There may be such instances, but I believe the general rule to be exactly the opposite. Such men, so far as by observation and reading extend, are usually more manly and genial than the average, and by the aid of these very qualities, they obtain a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recognized ascendancy. It is a great and common mistake to suppose that high intellectual powers are commonly associated with puny frames and small physical strength. Men of remarkable eminence are almost always men of vast powers of work. Those among them that have fallen into sedentary ways will frequently astonish their friends by their physical feats, when they happen to be in the mood of a vacation ramble. The Alpine Club contains a remarkable number of men of fair literary and scientific distinction; and these are among the strongest and most daring of the climbers. I believe, from my own recollections of the thews and energies of my contemporaries and friends of many years at Cambridge, that the first half-dozen class-men in classics or mathematics would have beaten, out of all proportion, the last half-dozen class-men in any trial of physical strength or endurance. Most notabilities have been great eaters and excellent digesters, on literally the same principle that the furnace which can raise more steam than is usual for one of its size must burn more freely and well than is common. Most great men are vigorous animals, with exuberant powers, and an extreme devotion to a cause. There is no reason to suppose that, in breeding for the highest order of intellect, we should produce a sterile or a feeble race.

Many forms of civilization have been peculiarly unfavorable to the hereditary transmission of rare talent. None of them were more prejudicial to it than that of the Middle Ages, where almost every youth of genius was attracted into the Church, and enrolled in the ranks of a celibate clergy.

Another great hindrance to it is a costly tone of society, like that of our own, where it becomes a folly for a rising man to encumber himself with domestic expenses, which custom exacts, and which are larger than his resources are able to meet. Here also genius is celibate, at least during the best period of manhood.

A spirit of caste is also bad, which compels a man of genius to select his wife from a narrow neighborhood, or from the members of a few families.

But a spirit of clique is not bad. I understand that in Germany it is very much the custom for professors to marry the daughters of other professors, and I have some reason to believe, but am anxious for further information before I can feel sure of it, that the enormous intellectual digestion of German literary men, which far exceeds that of the corresponding class of our own countrymen, may, in some considerable degree, be traceable to this practice.

So far as beauty is concerned, the custom of many countries, of the nobility purchasing the handsomest girls they could find for their wives, has laid the foundation of a higher type of features among the ruling classes. It is not so very long ago in England that it was thought quite natural that the strongest lance at the tournament should win the fairest or the noblest lady. The lady was the prize to be tilted for. She rarely objected to the arrangement, because her vanity was gratified by the *éclat* of the proceeding. Now history is justly charged with a tendency to repeat itself. We may, therefore, reasonably look forward to the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

possibility, I do not venture to say the probability, of a recurrence of some such practice of competition. What an extraordinary effect might be produced on our race, if its object was to unite in marriage those who possessed the finest and most suitable natures, mental, moral, and physical!

Let us, then, give reins to our fancy, and imagine a Utopia—or a Laputa, if you will—in which a system of competitive examination for girls, as well as for youths, had been so developed as to embrace every important quality of mind and body, and where a considerable sum was yearly allotted to the endowment of such marriages as promised to yield children who would grow into eminent servants of the State. We may picture to ourselves an annual ceremony in that Utopia or Laputa, in which the Senior Trustee of the Endowment Fund would address ten deeply-blushing young men, all of twenty-five years old, in the following terms:

> Gentlemen, I have to announce the results of a public examination, conducted on established principles; which show that you occupy the foremost places in your year, in respect to those qualities of talent, character, and bodily vigour which are proved, on the whole, to do most honour and best service to our race. An examination has also been conducted on established principles among all the young ladies of this country who are now of the age of twenty-one, and I need hardly remind you, that this examination takes note of grace, beauty, health, good temper, accomplished housewifery, and disengaged affections, in addition to noble qualities of heart and brain. By a careful investigation of the marks you have severally obtained, and a comparison of them, always on established principles, with those obtained by the most distinguished among the young ladies, we have been enabled to select ten of their names with especial reference to your individual qualities. It appears that marriages between you and these ten ladies, according to the list I hold in my hand, would offer the probability of unusual happiness to yourselves, and, what is of paramount interest to the State, would probably result in an extraordinarily talented issue. Under these circumstances, if any or all of these marriages should be agreed upon, the Sovereign herself will give away the brides, at a high and solemn festival, six months hence, in Westmister Abbey. We, on our part, are prepared, in each case, to assign 5000££ as a wedding-present, and to defray the cost of maintaining and educating your children, out of the ample funds entrusted to our disposal by the State.

If a twentieth part of the cost and pains were spent in measures for the improvement of the human race that is spent on the improvement of the breed of horses and cattle, what a galaxy of genius might we not create! We might introduce prophets and high priests of civilization into the world, as surely as we can propagate idiots by mating *cretins*. Men and women of the present day are, to those we might hope to bring into existence, what the pariah dogs of the streets of an Eastern town are to our own highly-bred varieties.

The feeble nations of the world are necessarily giving way before the nobler varieties of mankind; and even the best of these, so far as we know them, seem unequal to their work. The average culture of mankind is become so much

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

higher than it was, and the branches of knowledge and history so various and extended, that few are capable even of comprehending the exigencies of our modern civilization; much less of fulfilling them. We are living in a sort of intellectual anarchy, for the want of master minds. The general intellectual capacity of our leaders requires to be raised, and also to be differentiated. We want abler commanders, statesmen, thinkers, inventors, and artists. The natural qualifications of our race are no greater than they used to be in semi-barbarous times, though the conditions amid which we are born are vastly more complex than of old. The foremost minds of the present day seem to stagger and halt under an intellectual load too heavy for their powers.

PART II

([Galton's] Note - I take this opportunity of correcting a small *erratum* in my last paper. The name of the author of the forthcoming *Brief Biographical Dictionary* from which I quoted should have been the Rev. Charles Hole, not Hone.)

I have shown, in my previous paper, that intellectual capacity is so largely transmitted by descent that, out of every hundred sons of men distinguished in the open professions, no less than eight are found to have rivaled their fathers in eminence. It must be recollected that success of this kind implies the simultaneous inheritance of many points of character, in addition to mere intellectual capacity. A man must inherit good health, a love of mental work, a strong purpose, and considerable ambition, in order to achieve successes of the high order of which we are speaking. The deficiency of any one of these qualities would certainly be injurious, and probably be fatal to his chance of obtaining great distinction. But more than this: the proportion we have arrived at takes no account whatever of one-half of the hereditary influences that form the nature of the child. My particular method of inquiry did not admit of regard being paid to the influences transmitted by the mother, whether they had strengthened or weakened those transmitted by the father. Lastly, though the talent and character of both of the parents might, in any particular case, be of a remarkably noble order, and thoroughly congenial, yet they would necessarily have such mongrel antecedents that it would be absurd to expect their children to invariably equal them in their natural endowments. The law of atavism prevents it. When we estimate at its true importance this accumulation of impediments in the way of the son of a distinguished father rivaling his parent - the mother being selected, as it were, at haphazard—we cannot but feel amazed at the number of instances in which a successful rivalship has occurred. Eight per cent is as large a proportion as could have been expected on the most stringent hypothesis of hereditary transmission. No one, I think, can doubt, from the facts and analogies I have brought forward, that, if talented men were mated with talented women, of the same mental and physical characters as themselves, generation after generation, we might

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

produce a highly-bred human race, with no more tendency to revert to meaner ancestral types than is shown by our long-established breeds of race-horses and fox-hounds.

It may be said that, even granting the validity of my arguments, it would be impossible to carry their indications into practical effect. For instance, if we divided the rising generation into two castes, A and B, of which A was selected for natural gifts, and B was the refuse, then, supposing marriage was confined within the pale of the caste to which each individual belonged, it might be objected that we should simply differentiate our race - that we should create a good and a bad caste, but we should not improve the race as a whole. I reply that this is by no means the necessary result. There remains another very important law to be brought into play. Any agency, however indirect, that would somewhat hasten the marriages in caste A, and retard those in caste B, would result in a larger proportion of children being born to A than to B, and would end by wholly eliminating B, and replacing it by A.

Let us take a definite case, in order to give precision to our ideas. We will suppose the population to be, in the first instance, stationary; A and B to be equal in numbers; and the children of each married pair who survive to maturity to be rather more than two and a half in the case of A, and rather less than one and a half in the case of B. This no extravagant hypothesis. Half the population of the British Isles are born of mothers under the age of thirty years.

The result in the first generation would be that the total population would be unchanged, but that only one-third part of it would consist of the children of B. In the second generation, the descendants of B would be reduced to two-ninths of their original numbers, but the total population would begin to increase, owing to the greater preponderance of the prolific caste A. At this point the law of natural selection would powerfully assist in the substitution of caste A for caste B, by pressing heavily on the minority of weakly and incapable men.

The customs that affect the direction and date of marriages are already numerous. In many families, marriages between cousins are discouraged and checked. Marriages, in other respects appropriate, are very commonly deferred, through prudential considerations. If it was generally felt that intermarriages between A and B were as unadvisable as they are supposed to be between cousins, and that marriages in A ought to be hastened, on the ground of prudential considerations, while those in B ought to be discouraged and retarded, then, I believe, we should have agencies amply sufficient to eliminate B in a few generations.

I hence conclude that the improvement of the breed of mankind is no insuperable difficulty. If everybody were to agree on the improvement of the race of man being a matter of the very utmost importance, and if the theory of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the hereditary transmission of qualities in men was as thoroughly understood as it is in the case of our domestic animals, I see no absurdity in supposing that, in some way or other, the improvement would be carried into effect.

It remains for me in the present article to show that hereditary influence is as clearly marked in mental aptitudes as in general intellectual power. I will then enter into some of the considerations which my views on hereditary talent and character naturally suggest.

I will first quote a few of those cases in which characteristics have been inherited that clearly depend on peculiarities of organization. Prosper Lucas was among our earliest encyclopedists on this subject. It is distinctly shown by him, and agreed to by others, such as Mr G. Lewes, that predisposition to any form of disease, or any malformation, may become an inheritance. Thus disease of the heart is hereditary; so are tubercles in the lungs; so also are diseases of the brain, of the liver, and of the kidney; so are diseases of the eye and of the ear. General maladies are equally inheritable, as gout and madness. Longevity on the one hand, and premature deaths on the other, go by descent. If we consider a class of peculiarities, more recondite in their origin than these, we shall still find the law of inheritance to hold good. A morbid susceptibility to contagious disease, or to the poisonous effects of opium, or of calomel, and an aversion to the taste of meat, are all found to be inherited. So is a craving for drink, or for gambling, strong sexual passion, a proclivity to pauperism, to crimes of violence, and to crimes of fraud.

There are certain marked types of character, justly associated with marked types of feature and of temperament. We hold, axiomatically, that the latter are inherited (the case being too notorious, and too consistent with the analogy afforded by brute animals, to render argument necessary), and we therefore infer the same of the former. For instance, the face of the combatant is square, course, and heavily jawed. It differs from that of the ascetic, the voluptuary, the dreamer, and the charlatan.

Still more strongly marked than these, are the typical features and characters of different races of men. The Mongolians, Jews, Negroes, Gipsies, and American Indians severally propagate their kinds; and each kind differs in character and intellect, as well as in color and shape, from the other four. They, and a vast number of other races, form a class of instances worthy of close investigation, in which peculiarities of character are invariably transmitted from the parents to the offspring.

In founding argument on the innate character of different races, it is necessary to bear in mind the exceeding docility of man. His mental habits in mature life are the creatures of social discipline, as well as of inborn aptitudes, and it is impossible to ascertain what is due to the latter alone, except by observing several individuals of the same race, reared under various influences, and noting the peculiarities of character that invariably assert themselves. But, even when we have imposed these restrictions to check a hasty and imaginative

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conclusion, we find there remain abundant data to prove an astonishing diversity in the natural characteristics of different races. It will be sufficient for our purpose if we fix our attention upon the peculiarities of one or two of them.

The race of the American Indians is spread over an enormous area, and through every climate; for it reaches from the frozen regions of the North, through the equator down to the inclement regions of the South. It exists in thousands of disconnected communities, speaking nearly as many different languages. It has been subjected to a strange variety of political influences, such as its own despotisms in Peru, Mexico, Natchez, and Bogota, and its numerous republics, large and small. Members of the race have been conquered and ruled by military adventures from Spain and Portugal; others have been subjugated to Jesuitical rule; numerous settlements have been made by strangers on its soil; and, finally north of the continent has been colonized by European races. Excellent observers have watched the American Indians under all these influences, and their almost unanimous conclusion is as follows:-

> The race is divided into many varieties, but it has fundamentally the same character throughout the whole of America. The men, and in a less degree the women, are naturally cold, melancholic, patient, and taciturn. A father, mother, and their children, are said to live together in a hut, like persons assembled by accident, not tied by affection. The youths treat their parents with neglect, and often with such harshness and insolence as to horrify Europeans who have witnessed their conduct. The mothers have been seen to commit infanticide without the slightest discomposure, and numerous savage tribes have died out in consequence of this practice. The American Indians are eminently non-gregarious. They nourish a sullen reserve, and show little sympathy with each other, even when in great distress. The Spaniards had to enforce the common duties of humanities by positive laws. They are strangely taciturn. When not engaged in action they will sit whole days in one posture without opening their lips, and wrapped up in their narrow thoughts. They usually march in Indian file, that is to say, in a long line, at some distance from each other, without exchanging a word. They keep the same profound silence in rowing a canoe, unless they happen to be excited by some extraneous cause. On the other hand, their patriotism and local attachments are strong, and they have an astonishing sense of personal dignity. The nature of the American Indians appears to contain the minimum of affectionate and social qualities compatible with the continuance of their race.

Here, then, is a well-marked type of character, that formerly prevailed over a large part of the globe, with which other equally marked types of character in other regions are strongly contrasted. Take, for instance, the typical West African Negro. He is more unlike the Red man in his mind than in his body. Their characters are almost opposite, one to the other. The Red man has great patience, great reticence, great dignity, and no passion; the Negro has strong impulsive passions, and neither patience, reticence, nor dignity. He is warm-hearted, loving towards his master's children, and idolised by the children in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

return. He is eminently gregarious, for he is always jabbering, quarrelling, tom-tom-ing, or dancing. He is remarkably domestic, and he is endowed with such constitutional vigour, and is so prolific, that his race is irrepressible.

The Hindu, the Arab, the Mongol, the Teuton, and very many more, have each of them their peculiar characters. We have not space to analyse them on this occasion; but, whatever they are, they are transmitted, generation after generation, as truly as their physical forms.

What is true for the entire race is equally true for its varieties. If we were to select persons who were born with a type of character that we desired to intensify—suppose it was one that approached to some ideal standard of perfection—and if we compelled marriage within the limits of the society so selected, generation after generation; there can be no doubt that the offspring would ultimately be born with the qualities we sought, as surely as if we had been breeding for physical features, and not for intellect or disposition.

Our natural constitution seems to bear as direct and stringent a relation to that of our forefathers as any other physical effect does to its cause. Our bodies, minds, and capabilities of development have been derived from them. Everything we possess at our birth is a heritage from our ancestors.

Can we hand anything down to our children, that we have fairly won by our own independent exertions? Will our children be born with more virtuous dispositions, if we ourselves have acquired virtuous habits? Or are we no more than passive transmitters of a nature we have received, and which we have no power to modify? There are but a few instances in which habit even seems to be inherited. The chief among them are such as those of dogs being born excellent pointers; of the attachment to man shown by dogs; and of the fear of man, rapidly learnt and established among the birds of newly-discovered islands. But all of these admit of being accounted for on other grounds than the hereditary transmission of habits. Pointing is, in some faint degree, a natural disposition of all dogs. Breeders have gradually improved upon it, and created the race we now possess. There is nothing to show that the reason why dogs are born strong pointers is that their parents had been broken into acquiring an artificial habit. So as regards the fondness of dogs for man. It is inherent to a great extent in the genus. The dingo, or wild dog of Australia, is attached to the man who has caught him when a puppy, and clings to him even although he is turned adrift to hunt for his own living. This quality in dogs is made more intense by the custom of selection. The savage dogs are lost or killed; the tame ones are kept and bred from. Lastly, as regards the birds. As soon as any of their flock has learned to fear, I presume that its frightened movements on the approach of man form a language that is rapidly and unerringly understood by the rest, old or young; and that, after a few repetitions of the signal, man becomes an object of well-remembered mistrust. Moreover, just as natural selection has been shown to encourage love of man in domestic dogs, so it tends

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to encourage fear of man in all wild animals—the tamer varieties perishing owing to their misplaced confidence, and the wilder ones continuing their breed.

If we examine the question from the opposite side, a list of life-long habits in the parents might be adduced which leave no perceptible trace on their descendants. I cannot ascertain that the son of an old soldier learns his drill more quickly than the son of an artisan. I am assured that the sons of fishermen, whose ancestors have pursued the same calling time out of mind, are just as sea-sick as the sons of landsmen when they first go to sea. I cannot discover that the castes of India show signs of being naturally endowed with special aptitudes. If the habits of an individual are transmitted to his descendants, it is, as Darwin says, in a very small degree, and is hardly, if at all, traceable.

We shall therefore take an approximately correct view of the origin of our life, if we consider our own embryos to have sprung immediately from those embryos whence our parents were developed, and these from the embryos of *their* parents, and so on for ever. We should in this way look on the nature of mankind, and perhaps on that of the whole animated creation, as one continuous system, ever pushing out new branches in all directions, that variously interlace, and that bud into separate lives at every point of interlacement.

This simile does not at all express the popular notion of life. Most persons seem to have a vague idea that a new element, specially fashioned in heaven, and not transmitted by simple descent, is introduced into the body of every newly-born infant. Such a notion is unfitted to stand upon any scientific basis with which we are acquainted. It is impossible it should be true, unless there exists some property or quality in man that is not transmissible by descent. But the terms *talent* and *character* are exhaustive: they include the whole of man's spiritual nature so far as we are able to understand it. No other class of qualities is known to exist, that we might suppose to have been interpolated from on high. Moreover, the idea is improbable from a priori considerations, because there is no other instance in which creative power operates under our own observation at the present day, except it may be in the freedom in action of our own wills. Wherever else we turn our eyes, we see nothing but law and order, and effect following cause.

But though, when we look back to our ancestors, the embryos of our progenitors may be conceived to have been developed, in each generation, immediately from the one that preceded it, yet we cannot take so restricted a view when we look forward. The interval that separates the full-grown animal from its embryo is too important to be disregarded. It is in this interval that Darwin's law of natural selection comes into play; and those conditions are entered into, which affect, we know not how, the 'individual variation' of the offspring. I mean those that cause dissimilarity among brothers and sisters who are born successively, while twins, produced simultaneously, are often almost

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

identical. If it were possible that embryos should descend directly from embryos, there might be developments in every direction, and the world would be filled with monstrosities. But this is not the order of nature. It is her fiat that the natural tendencies of animals should never disaccord long and widely with the conditions under which they are placed. Every animal before it is of an age to bear offspring, has to undergo frequent stern examinations before the board of nature, under the laws of natural selection; where to be 'plucked' is not necessarily disgrace, but is certainly death. Never let it be forgotten that man, as a reasonable being, has the privilege of not being helpless under the tyranny of uncongenial requirements, but that he can, and that he does, modify the subjects in which nature examines him, and that he has considerable power in settling beforehand the relative importance in the examination that shall be assigned to each separate subject.

It becomes a question of great interest how far moral monstrosities admit of being bred. Is there any obvious law that assigns a limit to the propagation of supremely vicious or supremely virtuous natures? In strength, agility, and other physical qualities, Darwin's law of natural selection acts with unimpassioned, merciless severity. The weakly die in the battle for life; the stronger and more capable individuals are alone permitted to survive, and to bequeath their constitutional vigour to future generations. Is there any corresponding rule in respect to moral character? I believe there is, and I have already hinted at it when speaking of the American Indians. I am prepared to maintain that its action, by insuring a certain fundamental unity in the quality of the affections, enables men and the higher order of animals to sympathize in some degree with each other, and also, that this law forms the broad basis of our religious sentiments.

Animal life, in all but the very lowest classes, depends on at least one, and, more commonly, on all of the four following principles:- There must be affection, and it must be of four kinds: sexual, parental, filial, and social. The absolute deficiency of any one of these would be a serious hindrance, if not a bar to the continuance of any race. Those who possessed all of them, in the strongest measure, would, speaking generally, have an advantage in the struggle for existence. Without sexual affection, there would be no marriages, and no children; without parental affection, the children would be abandoned; without filial affection, they would stray and perish; and, without the social, each individual would be single-handed against rivals who were capable of banding themselves into tribes. Affection for others as well as self, is therefore a necessary part of animal character. Disinterestedness is as essential to a brute's well-being as selfishness. No animal lives for itself alone, but also, at least occasionally, for its parent, its mate, its offspring, or its fellow. Companionship is frequently more grateful to an animal than abundant food. The safety of her young is considered by many a mother as a paramount object to her own. The passion for a mate is equally strong. The gregarious bird posts itself during its

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

turn of duty as watchman on a tree, by the side of the feeding flock. Its zeal to serve the common cause exceeds its care to attend to its own interests. Extreme selfishness is not a common vice. Narrow thoughts of self by no means absorb the minds of ordinary men; they occupy a secondary position in the thoughts of the more noble and generous of our race. A large part of an Englishman's life is devoted to others, or to the furtherance of general ideas, and not to directly personal ends. The Jesuit toils for his order, not for himself. Many plan for that which they can never live to see. At the hour of death they are still planning. An incompleted will, which might work unfairness among those who would succeed to the property of a dying man, harasses his mind. Personal obligations of all sorts press as heavily as in the fullness of health, although the touch of death is known to be on the point of cancelling them. It is so with animals. A dog's thoughts are towards his master, even when he suffers the extremest pain. His mind is largely filled at all times with sentiments of affection. But disinterested feelings are more necessary to man than to any other animal, because of the long period of his dependent childhood, and also because of his great social needs, due to his physical helplessness. Darwin's law of natural selection would therefore be expected to develop these sentiments among men, even among the lowest barbarians, to a greater degree than among animals.

I believe that our religious sentiments spring primarily from these four sources. The institution of celibacy is an open acknowledgment that the theistic and human affections are more or less convertible; I mean that by starving the one class the other becomes more intense and absorbing. In savages, the theistic sentiment is chiefly, if not wholly, absent. I would refer my readers, who may hesitate in accepting this assertion, to the recently published work of my friend Sir John Lubbock, *Prehistoric Times*, p. 467-472, where the reports of travelers on the religion of savages are very ably and fairly collated. The theistic sentiment is secondary, not primary. It becomes developed within us under the influence of reflection and reason. All evidence tends to show that man is directed to the contemplation and love of God by instincts that he shares with the whole animal world, and that primarily appeal to the love of his neighbor.

Moral monsters are born among Englishmen, even at the present day; and, when they are betrayed by their acts, the law puts them out of the way, by the prison or the gallows, and so prevents them from continuing their breed. Townley, the murderer, is an instance in point. He behaved with decorum and propriety; he was perfectly well-conducted to the jail officials, and he corresponded with his mother in a style that was certainly flippant, but was not generally considered to be insane. However, with all this reasonableness of disposition, he could not be brought to see that he had done anything particularly wrong in murdering the girl that was disinclined to marry him. He was thoroughly consistent in his disregard for life, because, when his own existence became wearisome, he ended it with perfect coolness, by jumping

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from an upper staircase. It is a notable fact that a man without a conscience, like Townley, should be able to mix in English society for years, just like other people.

How enormous is the compass of the scale of human character, which reaches from dispositions like those we have just described, to that of Socrates! How various are the intermediate types of character that commonly fall under everybody's notice, and how differently are the principles of virtue measured out to different natures! We can clearly observe the extreme diversity of character in children. Some are naturally generous and open, others mean and tricky; some are warm and loving, others cold and heartless; some are meek and patient, others obstinate and self-asserting; some few have the tempers of angels, and at least as many have the tempers of devils. In the same way, as I showed in my previous paper, that by selecting men and women of rare and similar talent, and mating them together, generation after generation, an extraordinarily gifted race might be developed, so a yet more rigid selection, having regard to their moral nature, would, I believe, result in a no less marked improvement of their natural disposition.

Let us consider an instance in which different social influences have modified the inborn dispositions of a nation. The North American people has been bred from the most restless and combative class of Europe. Whenever, during the last ten or twelve generations, a political or religious party has suffered defeat, its prominent members, whether they were the best, or only the noisiest, have been apt to emigrate to America, as a refuge from persecution. Men fled to America for conscience sake, and for that of unappreciated patriotism. Every scheming knave, and every brutal ruffian, who feared the arm of the law, also turned his eyes in the same direction. Peasants and artisans, whose spirit rebelled against the tyranny of society and the monotony of their daily life, and men of a higher position, who chafed under conventional restraints, all yearned towards America. Thus the dispositions of the parents of the American people have been exceedingly varied, and usually extreme, either for good or for evil. But in one respect they almost universally agreed. Every head of an emigrant family brought with him a restless character, and a spirit apt to rebel. If we estimate the moral nature of Americans from their present social state, we shall find it to be just what we might have expected from such a parentage. They are enterprising, defiant, and touchy; impatient of authority; furious politicians; very tolerant of fraud and violence; possessing much high and generous spirit, and some true religious feeling, but strongly addicted to cant.

We have seen that the law of natural selection develops disinterested affection of a varied character even in animals and barbarian man. Is the same law different in its requirements when acting on civilized man? It is no doubt more favorable on the whole to civilized progress, but we must not expect to find as yet many marked signs of its action. As a matter of history, our Anglo-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Saxon civilization is only skin-deep. It is but eight hundred years, or twenty-six generations, since the Conquest, and the ancestors of the large majority of Englishmen were the merest boors at a much later date than that. It is said that among the heads of the noble houses of England there can barely be found one that has a right to claim the sixteen quarterings—that is to say, whose great-great-grandparents were, all of them (sixteen in number), entitled to carry arms. Generally the nobility of a family is represented by only a few slender rills among a multiplicity of non-noble sources.

The most noble quality that the requirements of civilization have hitherto bred in us, living as we do in a rigorous climate and on a naturally barren soil, is the instinct of continuous steady labor. This is alone possessed by civilized races, and it is possessed in a far greater degree by the feeblest individuals among them than by the most able-bodied savages. Unless a man can work hard and regularly in England, he becomes an outcast. If he only works by fits and starts he has not a chance of competition with steady workmen. An artisan who has variable impulses, and wayward moods, is almost sure to end in intemperance and ruin. In short, men who are born with wild and irregular dispositions, even though they contain much that is truly noble, are alien to the spirit of a civilized country, and they and their breed are eliminated from it by the law of selection. On the other hand, a wild, untamable restlessness is innate with savages. I have collected numerous instances where children of a low race have been separated at an early age from their parents, and reared as part of a settler's family, quite apart from their own people. Yet, after years of civilized ways, in some fit of passion, or under some craving, like that of a bird about to emigrate, they have abandoned their home, flung away their dress, and sought their countrymen in the bush, among whom they have subsequently been found living in contented barbarism, without a vestige of their gentle nurture. This is eminently the case with the Australians, and I have heard of many others in South Africa. There are also numerous instances in England where the restless nature of gipsy half-blood asserts itself with irresistible force.

Another difference, which may either be due to natural selection or to original difference of race, is the fact that savages seem incapable of progress after the first few years of their life. The average children of all races are much on a par. Occasionally, those of the lower races are more precocious than the Anglo-Saxons; as a brute beast of a few weeks old is certainly more apt and forward than a child of the same age. But, as the years go by, the higher races continue to progress, while the lower ones gradually stop. They remain children in mind, with the passions of grown men. Eminent genius commonly asserts itself in tender years, but it continues long to develop. The highest minds in the highest race seem to have been those who had the longest boyhood. It is not those who were little men in early youth who have succeeded. Here I may remark that, in the great mortality that besets the children of our poor, those who are members of precocious families, and who are therefore able to help in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

earning wages at a very early age, have a marked advantage over their competitors. They, on the whole, live, and breed their like, while the others die. But, if this sort of precocity be unfavorable to a race—if it be generally followed up by an early arrest of development, and by a premature old age—then modern industrial civilization, in encouraging precocious varieties of men, deteriorates the breed.

Besides these three points of difference—endurance of steady labor, tameness of disposition, and prolonged development—I know of none that very markedly distinguishes the nature of the lower classes of civilized man from that of barbarians. In the excitement of a pillaged town the English soldier is just as brutal as the savage. Gentle manners seem, under those circumstances, to have been a mere gloss thrown by education over a barbarous nature. One of the effects of civilization is to diminish the rigor of the application of the law of natural selection. It preserves weakly lives, that would have perished in barbarous lands. The sickly children of a wealthy family have a better chance of living and rearing offspring than the stalwart children of a poor one. As with the body, so with the mind. Poverty is more adverse to early marriages than is natural bad temper, or inferiority of intellect. In civilized society, money interposes her aegis between the law of natural selection and very many of its rightful victims. Scrofula and madness are naturalized among us by wealth; short-sightedness is becoming so. There seems no limit to the morbific tendencies of body or mind that might accumulate in a land where the law of primogeniture was general, and where riches were more esteemed than personal qualities. Neither is there any known limit to the intellectual and moral grandeur of nature that might be introduced into aristocratical families, if their representatives, who have such rare privilege in winning wives that please them best, should invariably, generation after generation, marry with a view of transmitting those noble qualities to their descendants. Inferior blood in the representative of a family might be eliminated from it in a few generations. The share that a man retains in the constitution of his remote descendants is inconceivably small. The father transmits, on an average, one-half of his nature, the grandfather one-fourth, the great-grandfather one-eighth; the share decreasing step by step, in a geometrical ratio, with great rapidity. Thus the man who claims descent from a Norman baron, who accompanied William the Conqueror twenty-six generations ago, has so minute a share of that baron's influence in his constitution, that, if he weighs fourteen stone, the part of him which may be ascribed to the baron (supposing, of course, there have been no additional lines of relationship) is only one-fiftieth of a grain in weight—an amount ludicrously disproportioned to the value popularly ascribed to ancient descent. As a stroke of policy, I question if the head of a great family, or a prince, would not give more strength to his position, by marrying a wife who would bear him talented sons than one who would merely bring him the support of high family connections.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With the few but not insignificant exceptions we have specified above, we are still barbarians in our nature, and we show it in a thousand ways. The children who dabble and dig in the dirt have inherited the instincts of untold generations of barbarian forefathers, who dug with their nails for a large fraction of their lives. Our ancestors were grubbing by the hour, each day, to get at the roots they chiefly lived upon. They had to grub out pitfalls for their games, holes for their palisades and hut-poles, hiding-places, and ovens. Man became a digging animal by nature; and so we see the delicately-reared children of our era very ready to revert to primeval habits. Instinct breaks out in them, just as it does in the silk-haired, boudoir-nurtured spaniel, with a ribbon round its neck, that runs away from the endearments of its mistress, to sniff and revel in some road-side mess of carrion.

It is a common theme of moralists of many creeds, that man is born with an imperfect nature. He has lofty aspirations, but there is a weakness in his disposition that incapacitates him from carrying his nobler purposes into effect. He sees that some particular course of action is his duty, and should be his delight; but his inclinations are fickle and base, and do not conform to his better judgment. The whole moral nature of man is tainted with sin, which prevents him from doing the things he knows to be right.

I venture to offer an explanation of this apparent anomaly, which seems perfectly satisfactory from a scientific point of view. It is neither more nor less than that the development of our nature, under Darwin's law of natural selection, has not yet overtaken the development of our religious civilization. Man was barbarous but yesterday, and therefore it is not to be expected that the natural aptitudes of his race should already have become molded into accordance with his very recent advance. We men of the present centuries are like animals suddenly transplanted among new conditions of climate and of food: our instincts fail us under the altered circumstances.

My theory is confirmed by the fact that the members of old civilizations are far less sensible than those newly converted from barbarism of their nature being inadequate to their moral needs. The conscience of a Negro is aghast at his own wild, impulsive nature, and is easily stirred by a preacher, but it is scarcely possible to ruffle the self-complacency of a steady-going Chinaman.

The sense of original sin would show, according to my theory, not that man was fallen from a high estate, but that he was rapidly rising from a low one. It would therefore confirm the conclusion that has been arrived at by every independent line of ethnological research—that our forefathers were utter savages from the beginning; and, that, after myriads of years of barbarism, our race has but very recently grown to be civilized and religious.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

End Notes

Part I, *MacMillan's Magazine*, 11 (November, 1864-April, 1865), pp. 157-166; Part II, *MacMillan's Magazine*, 11 (November, 1864-April, 1865), pp. 318-327.

*Cowan, Ruth Schwartz, *Sir Francis Galton and the Study of Heredity in the Nineteenth Century*, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1985, see chapter one, "'Hereditary Talent and Character': Galton's First Attempt to Study Heredity," pp. 1-44.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HENRY FORD AND THE JEWISH QUESTION

Henry Ford and the Jews:
The Mass Production of Hate
by Neil Baldwin
New York: Public Affairs, 2001
$27.50 US

416 pp.

The International Jew:
The World's Foremost Problem
by Henry Ford
Dearborn, MI: Dearborn Independent, 1920–1921

Reviewed By Kevin MacDonald

PART I: THE EDUCATION OF A MIDWESTERN INDUSTRIALIST

Neil Baldwin's book on Henry Ford begins by sketching the "McGuffeyland" world of Ford's childhood — a world of courageous, honest, abstemious, hard-working boys. Ford's beloved mother read the McGuffey readers to her favorite son, and in his adult life Ford became an avid collector not only of McGuffey first editions but of other Americana as well. This bespeaks Ford's strong identification with the mid-western culture of his youth, and, in Baldwin's view, that is a big part of the problem, because part of that mid-western culture was a subtle anti-Semitism. The McGuffey readers contained passages from *The Merchant of Venice* in which Shylock is described as an "inhuman wretch, incapable of pity," a man filled with irrational hatred for the Christian Antonio. Baldwin implies that given such a culture, it is a small step to Ford's "mass production of hate."

Beginning in 1881, this perceived idyllic Anglo-Saxon culture of Ford's youth began to be invaded by a wave of Eastern European Jewish immigrants. This provided an additional impetus to anti-Jewish feelings, culminating in the immigration restriction legislation of 1924. In Baldwin's view, the nativism and xenophobia of the period were,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> the results of the compulsion to find a "stereotyped other" against whom endangered Christians could measure themselves. In the strange, nervous netherworld blurring the end of one century and the beginning of the next, with the American economy continuing to suffer bewildering fluctuations and booms followed by depressions, there was a vague sense that unseen, hidden, and irrational 'market forces' were determining the course of personal destiny.
>
> Christian identity was under siege in the rapidly changing modern Promised Land. "The Jew was conveniently at hand," enabling the character of early-modern racism in America to be formed on the notion that people who were "different" could be actual instruments of change and therefore could be held accountable for otherwise inexplicable trends in the culture of modernity. Once that blame was affixed, antisemites had latched upon a real reason to criticize, contain, or even control the Jews. (pp. 34–35)

Baldwin thus proposes that Ford's anti-Jewish animus derives from the need for a scapegoat upon which to blame all disapproved forms of modernism. As is typical of writing on such topics these days, there is no honest assessment of the extent to which Jews were in fact responsible for the changes deplored by Ford and his ilk. Instead, Baldwin traces the anti-Jewish tenor of the series of newspaper articles on Jewish issues sponsored by Ford and published as *The International Jew: The World's Foremost Problem*, solely to "a thousand-year continuum of Jew hatred, thick taproots sunk deep into the archetypal, richly poisoned soil of medievalism. " (p. 106)

> Medieval, religious Jew-hatred evolved into modern anti-semitism . . . They should be recognized as different factors within the same tradition. Both passions are infused with a pathological requisite to find someone to *resent*. (p. 107)

As we shall see, this is neither a fair nor an accurate description or analysis of the contents of *The International Jew*.

Ford is presented as an assimilationist, not a racialist. He eagerly sought immigrant labor for his automobile factories, but also wanted a culturally homogeneous citizenry, seeking "to impress upon these men that they are, or should be, Americans, and *that their former racial, national, and linguistic differences are to be forgotten*" (p. 41; emphasis in text). In the early part of the century, Ford workers from a wide range of Eastern and Southern European countries (including 12,000 Jews recruited to work in the automobile industry in Detroit) were required to attend Americanization schools aimed at impressing upon them a common American culture. In a 1919 column in the *Dearborn Independent*, the writer complained,

> The problem [with the melting pot] is not . . . with the pot so much as it is with the base metal. Some metals cannot be assimilated, refuse to mix with the molten mass of citizenship, but remain ugly, indissoluble lumps. How did this base metal get in? . . . What *about* those aliens who have given us so much trouble, these Bolsheviki messing up our industries and disturbing our civil life? (p. 80; emphasis in text)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Baldwin terms this a "disturbing euphemism" (p. 80).

A major intellectual influence on Ford was David Starr Jordan, first president of Stanford University and a prolific writer on racial and cultural issues. (Louis Marshall, president of the American Jewish Congress, considered Jordan to be the main source of Ford's "insane prejudice" [p. 50].) Jordan was a eugenicist who advocated peace for racialist reasons—that war decimated strong people from the gene pool. Jordan, writing in 1912, also developed the view that financial manipulators, mainly Jews, were driving Europeans to war. (Ford became a leader of the peace movement during World War I, stating to another peace activist that the "German-Jewish bankers caused the war" [p. 59].) Jordan (1912) described an "unseen empire" of international finance, largely composed of Jewish banking firms originating with the Rothschilds. Behind these firms were Jewish families "allied to one another by so many close ties of blood, marriage, and business" (pp. 19–20), including Bischoffheim (France), Bleichröder (Germany), Camondo (Italy), Goldschmid and Stern (England, Portugal), Günzberg (Russia), Hirsch and Wertheimer (Austria), Cassell (Europe, Egypt), Sassoon ("Rothschilds of the Orient), Mendelssohn and Montefiore (Australia).

According to Jordan, because of massive national debts, the financiers effectively controlled the countries they operated in, either by threatening to withhold loans or by making conditions on loans. Ultimately Jordan blamed the borrowers for their profligacy and shortsightedness. As a pacifist, Jordan was deeply concerned that the military spending of his day would bring about an Armageddon. In general, he saw the financiers as eager to loan money for weaponry but opposed to actual war. His clear message, however, is that this unseen empire of finance has a very large influence on the ability of governments to wage war. He presented several examples where wars ended because financiers refused to loan any more money for the effort. Given this intellectual environment, and given the gruesome reality of what was then called simply "the Great War," Ford presumably inferred that Jewish financiers must at least have allowed it to happen, and indeed this is the argument made in *The International Jew* (*TIJ*).

It is noteworthy that ideas of eugenics, racially motivated pacifism, and belief in the power of international financiers were entirely respectable at the time. Baldwin recounts Ford's journey to the West Coast in 1915 to attend a "Race-Betterment Conference" in San Francisco. Speakers included Luther Burbank, the renowned plant breeder; Jordan; and Charles Eliot, president of Harvard. Attendees included Thomas Edison, and millionaires like John Harvey Kellogg (of the cereal company) and Harvey Firestone (of the tire company). Edison had fairly moderate views on Jews: Jews held to a very clannish social structure that separated them from other peoples; they were also very intelligent, keen businessmen with a penchant for becoming wealthy, and this sometimes provoked hostility.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There was considerable intellectual interaction going on among nativists during the post-World War I period, including some of the military intelligence figures portrayed in Joseph Bendersky's *"The Jewish Threat": Anti-Semitic Politics of the U.S. Army*. For example, Houghton Harris, a military physician, worked closely with Boris Brasol, the Russian refugee from Bolshevism, in producing an English version of the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. In turn, Brasol impressed himself on the editors of *The Dearborn Independent*, Ford's newspaper, which published an article by Brasol depicting the horror of the Bolshevik takeover of Russia.

The two people who actually wrote *TIJ* were Ernest Liebold and Billy Cameron. Liebold was a college-educated bank president before he became Ford's personal secretary and alter-ego. Cameron was a journalist who subscribed to an early version of the Christian identity movement, which holds to the view that the Anglo-Saxons descended from one of the lost tribes of Israel. The British were therefore the true Chosen People, destined by God to rule the world, and Great Britain and the U.S. were Holy Lands given by God to his Chosen People. (The corollary that today's Jews are not really descended from the people described in the Bible appears in *TIJ*. "The Jews are not the Old Testament People. . . . They are a Talmudical people" [3/12/1921].) The main force behind the articles, then, besides Ford, was Liebold, but he was careful to give credit to Cameron as the person who compiled the data and actually wrote the articles.

Typical of the period, the Jewish response to the series of articles appearing in *The Dearborn Independent* was formulated by prominent and wealthy Jewish activists associated with the American Jewish Committee: Jacob Schiff, Louis Marshall, and Cyrus Adler. Schiff, the consummate Jewish activist of the period, had carried on a personal campaign against the tsarist government for years, including financing the Japanese war effort against Russia in 1905, financing anti-tsarist revolutionaries, and supporting Germany in World War I until the tsar was overthrown in the spring of 1917. Schiff worried that waging a high-profile attack on *TIJ* might backfire: "If we get into a controversy we shall light a fire, which no one can foretell how it will become extinguished, and I would strongly advise therefore that no notice be taken of [the articles] and the attack will soon be forgotten" (p. 112). However, Schiff's death on September 25, 1920, signaled a change to a more proactive stance, led by Louis Marshall.

In an event reminiscent of the pressure exerted on St. Martin's Press to rescind publication of David Irving's biography of Goebbels, Baldwin recounts the pressure by Louis Marshall to rescind publication of *The Cause of World Unrest*, a commentary on the *Protocols* that had originally appeared in the *London Morning Post*. The publisher, Major George Haven Putnam, caved in after originally arguing in favor of publication on the basis of free speech, the book's opposition to Bolshevism, and prior publication by a respectable British

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

publisher. At the same time, the American Jewish Committee purchased copies of John Spargo's book attacking Ford, *The Jew and American Ideals*, "in lots of 10,000" (p. 150). Spargo, who was not Jewish, was a well-known socialist and advocate on labor issues who had developed a reputation as a muckraking journalist. Spargo also composed a statement titled *The Perils of Racial Prejudice* and solicited signatures from over 100 prominent "citizens of Gentile extraction and Christian faith," including presidents (Taft, Wilson, Harding), secretaries of state, ecclesiastical dignitaries, businessmen, and writers. Among the signatories was David Starr Jordan, whose writings on the "unseen world" of Jewish international finance had been a major influence on Ford. *The Perils of Racial Prejudice* was published in newspapers across the country on January 16, 1921 with the headline "President Wilson Heads Protest Against Anti-Semitism."

In early 1922, Ford, while not disowning them, abruptly put a stop to the articles. His reasons for doing so remain mysterious. Baldwin suggests that Ford was concerned about negative repercussions of *TIJ* on his auto business and that he harbored political ambitions that would be compromised by the series. In any case, there was no change in Ford's attitudes, and anti-Jewish references and articles continued to appear occasionally in the *Dearborn Independent*. For example, Julius Rosenwald, chairman of Sears, Roebuck, was criticized for encouraging black migration from the south to Chicago by providing inexpensive land and housing. This linkage between "Jewish money and 'the Negro problem' " resulted in "corrupting the neighborhood, driving away older owners, and leading to the race riots of 1919" (p. 201).

Ford eventually apologized for *TIJ* in conjunction with settlement of a libel suit brought by Aaron Sapiro, a Jewish activist on farming issues, who was the subject of several articles in 1924. (The first article was titled, "Jewish Exploitation of Farmers' Organizations—Monopoly Traps Operate Under Guise of 'Marketing Associations.'") In 1927, after a mistrial had been declared because of allegations that a juror had been bribed by a Jew, Ford declared an end to *The Dearborn Independent* and settled his lawsuit with Sapiro. Again, the reasons for this sudden change remain uncertain, although Baldwin suggests that it was motivated by the upcoming introduction of the Ford Model A prompted by lagging sales of the Model T. It seems unlikely that the prospect of losing a libel verdict for a relatively trifling sum to an immensely wealthy man would be sufficient motivation for so abrupt a move, especially since the article was not part of the original *International Jew* series. According to Gerald L. K. Smith, the anti-Jewish political organizer, Ford himself claimed that he did it "because of an attempt by New York Jews . . . to take over the Ford Motor Company" (p. 306). A similar claim was also published in 1927 by the *Völkischer Beobachter*, Hitler's newspaper, edited by Theodore Fritsch (see Reznikoff, 1957, p. 387), but there is no independent corroboration for this theory.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ford signed an apology for the articles that had been drafted by Louis Marshall in which he issued a complete retraction and asked for forgiveness. The apology also stated that he "was fully aware of the virtues of the Jewish people as a whole, of what they and their ancestors have done for civilization and to mankind and toward the development of commerce and industry, of their sobriety and diligence, their benevolence and their unselfish interest in the public welfare" (p. 239). Ford signed the letter without reading it, and there can be little doubt that he did not change his mind about Jewish issues. (In his letters, Marshall recounts a personal meeting in 1928 with Ford in which Ford "showed that he sincerely repented. He expressed his readiness to do anything that I might at any time suggest to enable him to minimize the evil that had been done." Marshall also wrote that Ford told him that Cameron was "out of a job and had indicated his willingness to write on the Jewish side of the subject. I replied that we did not need his help" [in Reznikoff 1957, 388].)

In 1938, Ford received the Grand Cross of the German Eagle and kept it despite a wave of protest from the Jewish press. (Another recipient was Charles Lindbergh, whose conversations with Ford dealt mainly with Jewish issues.) Ford later provided financial support for Gerald L. K. Smith, who continued publishing *TIJ* well into the post-World War II period. After the closure of the *Dearborn Independent*, Ernest Liebold, Ford's alter ego, fed information on Jewish issues to Charles Coughlin, the Catholic priest whose radio broadcasts and publications during the 1930s carried on many of the themes of *TIJ*.

After Ford died, his company distanced itself from his anti-Jewish writings. The Ford Motor Company became a generous supporter of Jewish charities and the state of Israel, and in 1997 the Ford Motor Company sponsored a commercial-free telecast of Stephen Spielberg's *Schindler's List*.

Baldwin discusses how he started writing the biography of Ford as an aspect of his own awakening Jewish identity. The book shows a strong emotional engagement between the writer and his material, and there is an apologetic stance regarding anti-Jewish attitudes. For example, Baldwin notes that early in the series, *TIJ* claimed that the behavior of the Jews had given rise to

> the Jewish Question, but not once is there any reference to a single, well-defined question. By invoking "the Jewish Question" in this reactive manner, without defining it—or for that matter, asking it—the *Dearborn Independent* took another giant step into antisemitic rhetorical tradition (p. 130).

This is an exaggeration at best. As described below, *TIJ* discusses a great many Jewish issues in considerable detail. Indeed, a reader of Baldwin's book would have almost no idea of what *TIJ* actually claimed about Jews or about the quality of the evidence used to support the claims. Instead, Baldwin quotes a Yiddish newspaper which had the following analysis of Jewish activism:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> One hears from Jewish leaders in every movement because they are the most talented; therefore one hears from Jewish activists in every new trend because they are the more feeling, idealistic, and—purer. And precisely because of this, they hate us. *Only* because of this!!! (p. 132; emphasis added).

The comment is completely in line with Baldwin's implicit analysis throughout: There are no conflicts of interest between Jews and non-Jews. Indeed, Jews have no interests at all; they are completely divided among themselves and unable to act coherently on any issue. When they do act, they act out of purely idealistic motives, for the good of all. Anti-Jewish attitudes and behavior must therefore be completely irrational.

Amazingly, Baldwin argues against the idea that Jews were unified by showing dissension within the American Jewish Committee (AJC) on how to respond to *TIJ*: Should the AJC distribute copies of a recent book titled *Jewish Contributions to Civilization*? Advocate a consumer boycott of Ford products? Compile a dossier of anti-Jewish incidents possibly instigated by the series? But the broader issue of Jewish influence and whether Jews are unified on certain issues is much more complicated than suggested by Baldwin. *TIJ* does indeed overestimate the extent to which the Jewish community was unified at the time, particularly in its discussions of the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* in which Jews are portrayed as consciously seeking to subjugate the non-Jewish world with a very detailed plan of conquest. However, the *Protocols* are only one aspect of *TIJ*. There are a great many areas where *TIJ* documents a great deal of unanimity within the Jewish community, as in campaigns to remove public displays of Christianity or language suggesting the United States is a Christian nation, withdrawing literature and other cultural artifacts deemed anti-Jewish (e.g., the campaign to remove *The Merchant of Venice* from the high school curriculum), open immigration, U.S. foreign policy toward countries perceived as anti-Jewish (e.g., toward Russia prior to the fall of the Czar and the Bolshevik Revolution; toward Poland and Romania after World War I). These remain areas of broad Jewish consensus in the contemporary United States (Goldberg, 1996; MacDonald, 1998b, Ch. 8). Moreover, the issue of Jewish influence is not dependent on Jewish unanimity. For example, even though there was a split in the Jewish community of the period over the issue of Communism and support for the Soviet Union, this does not imply that Jewish Communists were not critically important to the success of Bolshevism, nor does it imply that Jewish Communists were not typically motivated by their Jewish identity, as indeed they were (MacDonald, 1998b, Ch. 3).

TIJ makes its case for Jewish unity primarily by citing Jewish sources advocating the need for Jewish organization on Jewish issues and by arguing that during this period the New York Jewish community was organized as a *Kehilla*, the traditional form of Jewish social structure in the Diaspora. As *TIJ* notes, the Kehillah was organized in response to the comment by General Bingham, the chief of police of New York City, that Jews were responsible for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

50% of the crime in the city. *TIJ* states that "The Kehillah is a perfect answer to the statement that the Jews are so divided among themselves as to render a concert of action impossible" (2/26/1921). *TIJ* shows that the Kehillah had strong links to the main national Jewish organization, the American Jewish Committee, and had representatives from a wide range of Jewish organizations. The membership of the Kehillah consisted of all gradations of Jewish religious observance, from Orthodox to secular leftists. The Kehillah divided the city into eighteen districts comprising one hundred Jewish neighborhoods. In addition to attempting to prevent Jewish crime, the Kehillah served as an activist organization in advancing Jewish causes. For example, the Kehillah was a prominent force in the attempt to remove Christian symbolism from public places—a major irritant in the eyes of *TIJ*.

In general, the less said of Baldwin's book the better. It is an apologetic work with a depressingly familiar and predictable take on the anti-Jewish attitudes of the period. Baldwin writes that *TIJ* descends into the "antisemitic rhetorical tradition," but his book descends into another tradition, a tradition in which the anti-Jewish attitudes and behavior of earlier generations are ascribed entirely to irrational pathologies having nothing to do with Jewish behavior. It is a tradition based on caricature, exaggerations, and misrepresentations of what these people actually believed.

Kevin MacDonald is Professor of Psychology, California State University (Long Beach), and the author of author of a trilogy on Judaism as an evolutionary strategy: ***A People that Shall Dwell Alone*** *(1994),* ***Separation and Its Discontents*** *(1998), and* ***The Culture of Critique*** *(1998), all published by Praeger 1994-1998.*

References

Cuddihy, J. M. *No Offense Civil Religion and Protestant Taste* New York: Seabury Press, 1978.

Editors of *Fortune Jews in America* New York: Random House, 1936.

Elazar, D. J. *Community and Polity Organizational Dynamics of American Jewry*, first published in 1976, Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1980.

Gabler, N. *An Empire of Their Own: How the Jews Invented Hollywood* New York: Crown Publishers, 1988.

Gibbon, E. *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, 7 vols., ed. J. B. Bury. London: Methuen, 1909.

Jordan, D. S. *Unseen Empire: A Study of the Plight of Nations that Do Not Pay Their Debts.* Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1912.

Judge, E. H. *Easter in Kishinev: Anatomy of a Pogrom* New York: New York University Press, 1992.

Kanter, K. A. *The Jews on Tin Pan Alley: The Jewish Contribution to American Popular Music, 1830–1940* New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1982.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Katz, J. *Jewish Emancipation and Self-Emancipation*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1986.

Lindemann, A. S. *The Jew Accused: Three Anti-Semitic Affairs (Dreyfus, Beilis, Frank) 1894–1915*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Lindemann, A. S. *Esau's Tears: Modern Anti-Semitism and the Rise of the Jews* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

MacDonald, K. B. *A People that Shall Dwell Alone: Judaism as a Group Evolutionary Strategy* Westport, CT: Praeger, 1994/2002.

MacDonald, K. B. *Separation and Its Discontents: Toward an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism* Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998a.

MacDonald, K. B. *The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements* Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998b; Paperback edition, Bloomington, IN, 2002.

MacDonald, K. B. Preface to the First Paperback edition of *The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements* Bloomington, IN: 1stbooks, 2002.

Marcus, S. *Father Coughlin: The Tumultuous Life of the Priest of the Little Flower* Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1973.

Medved, M. *Hollywood vs. America* New York: HarperPerennial Library, 1992/1993.

Neuringer, S. M. *American Jewry and United States Immigration Policy, 1881–1953* New York: Arno Press, 1980.

Reznikoff, C. (ed.) *Louis Marshall: Champion of Liberty; Selected Papers and Addresses*, Vol. 1. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1957.

Ross, E. A. *The Old World and the New: The Significance of Past and Present Immigration to the American People* NewYork: The Century Co., 1914.

Sachar, H. M. *A History of Jews in America* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992.

Samuel, M. *You Gentiles*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1924.

Shamir, I. *Mamilla Pool*, 4/24/2001. http://www.israelshamir.net/mamilla_english.htm

Warren, D. *Radio Priest: Charles Coughlin, the Father of Hate Radio* New York: The Free Press, 1996.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VICTORIAN HEREDITARY GENIUS

A Life of Sir Francis Galton

Nicholas Wright Gillham
Oxford University Press, 2001
$35.00 US
416 pp.

Reviewed by Gavan Tredoux

This is only the third full-length biography of the eminent Victorian scientist and polymath Sir Francis Galton (1822-1911). Remarkably, it is the first in a quarter of a century; the previous two include D. W. Forrest's biography in 1974, and the major three-volume biography by the pioneering statistician Karl Pearson.

Galton was the product of a distinguished lineage, with men of marked ability in every one of ten preceding generations. He first made a name as an African explorer and meteorologist, active in the affairs of the Royal Geographical Society. Late in life, inspired by his half-cousin Charles Darwin, he went on to found the scientific study of heritability as the intellectual architect of contemporary behavior genetics, which soon encompassed differential psychology, anthropology, genetics, criminology, statistical methods, and eugenics.

Starting almost from scratch in all the subjects he investigated, Galton invented rigorous intelligence testing, founded experimental psychology in Britain, established the scientific basis for fingerprint identification, formulated the statistical concepts of regression and correlation, pioneered early investigations of genetics, and founded the biometrical school. Financially secured by a legacy from his moderately wealthy father, he might have followed so many of his contemporaries into comfortable idleness. Instead he chose the career of "gentleman scientist," and would on his death bequest his well-managed legacy to University College, London, for further research in eugenics and other related areas of scientific interest.

Galton receives little notice today, so any new biography must be welcomed for the renewed attention it may bring to his life, his achievements, and his contemporary significance. Nicholas Gillham is a geneticist whose interest in Galton was stimulated by recent developments in the human genome project,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the advent of genetic engineering, and cloning, all of which contain distinct echoes of the eugenics movement Galton founded. Gillham plays here to his own strengths and interests as a geneticist. Since Galton was not primarily a geneticist, he emerges from Gillham's treatment looking unfairly diminished, somewhat less relevant than he really is to contemporary science and the history of ideas. However, when properly understood Galton occupies a central place in the development of scientific ideas, as the founder of a research program that remains vital today.

Galton's wide-ranging achievements were grounded in his immense practical genius. This was a general ability, not specific to any discipline, which enabled him to make an impression on nearly everything he embarked on. He had no formal training in most of the subjects he covered, starting almost from a clean slate in each. If previous work had been done, he usually ignored it, with good results.

Galton was simply not well suited to the sort of education then offered. While he was remarkably precocious as a child when tutored at home by an elder sister, he performed only moderately well at school. At Cambridge, studying pure mathematics on the advice of Charles Darwin, he suffered a breakdown and left, like Darwin, with only a "pass" degree, and not "honors." Most of his scientific work was conducted when he was well past middle age, and he would not read widely in his fields, such as they existed.

Galton's practical genius helped him to achieve his first notable success as an African explorer, thereby launching his scientific career. After a two-year exploration of South-West Africa (1850-2) during which he accurately surveyed and charted previously unknown territory, all at his own expense, he was awarded a gold medal by the Royal Geographical Society. His entertaining description of the expedition in *Tropical South Africa* (1852) demonstrates an ability to easily overcome the innumerable practical difficulties which an explorer in unknown territory must face with limited resources, and severe consequences for failure. Galton was obviously a good man to go camping with. He would later produce a best-selling compendium of advice for travelers, *The Art of Travel* (1855), distilling his own experience in solving the practical problems of rough travel, and advice gleaned from others. It went through nine editions in his lifetime, and is still in print today. This manual of "shifts and contrivances" reveals a tremendous talent for grappling with everyday difficulties, for devising working contraptions from simple materials, and for applying basic reasoning processes to common problems. Galton would later demonstrate how a simple application of this method to important theoretical questions could convert subjects formerly reserved for metaphysical speculation into science.

The Art of Travel is full of little devices and elementary technology, all produced by Galton's facility for invention, which was a family trait. All through his life he produced a stream of gadgets, which ranged from devices

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for measuring temperature changes over time, to a heliograph for sending sun signals, to whistles for producing high-pitched notes (all of which were extensively used in their fields). There were also devices for harnessing the power of waves, a protocol for interstellar communication, an electric telegraph, a bicycle speedometer, glasses for reading underwater, and scores more. Galton would outfit his scientific researches with instruments that were mostly of his own invention, made to his specifications, almost always for the purpose of measuring something. Much of his research would have made little progress without these instruments, and they were extensively used in their fields. Again, these show the practical genius he invariably brought to bear on his problem set, whether he was in Africa placating a braying donkey by tying a stone to its tail, or in London devising an instrument to measure mental reaction times.

Another important aspect of Galton's practical ability was his talent for simple representation. In meteorology this took the form of greatly improved weather maps, with Galton becoming the first newspaper weather columnist. In statistics it took the form of the quincunx, his device for demonstrating regression in normal distributions; his numerical representation of statistical relationship, the correlation coefficient; and the use of statistical percentiles. For navigation he devised wind charts, so that sailing time could be optimized. For personal and racial identification he devised composite portraits and facial indices. Galton was always finding some way to represent facts not otherwise obvious. More generally, Galton continually sought to create numerical representations of facts through *measurement*, an activity he carried to extraordinary lengths.

The "active ingredient" of Galton's science was his use of measurement, especially in his study of human traits. Counting and comparison were second-nature to him, and he would often idle away slack periods by measuring things: counting brush strokes when having his portrait painted, thereby estimating the number of facial characteristics; counting audience fidgets in lectures, to determine their dullness; counting the number of attractive women he passed in the street, to determine the geographical distribution of beauty in Britain; or just counting leaves on trees in the park, to see how many there really were.

Galton studied human abilities and characteristics by measuring them. This was a genuinely revolutionary approach. Usually he had to devise these measures himself, and mechanical instruments for gathering them, as well as the statistical methods for dealing with the results. Where Galton could not obtain direct numerical measurements he was still able to reason numerically by considering variation and distribution. Intelligence testing, anthropometry, and biometry were born as a result. The statistical revolution that Galton introduced in his quest for measurement spread rapidly throughout the social and biological sciences, because the methods used were universal in nature.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Quantitative methods now distinguish most serious research in the social and biological sciences, and disciplines which have spurned them have not fared well (consider mainstream sociology).

One great virtue of Galton's use of measurement was its ability to cut through tangles introduced by metaphysical speculation, and ground discussion in tangible phenomena. His measures would provide their own defense by demonstrating solid relationships with other phenomena, above all by acquiring predictive power. The utility of this approach is seen in the modern intelligence testing movement, which has bypassed endless wrangling over the "meaning" of intelligence by working with measures of mental powers that justify themselves by predicting real-world outcomes.

Galton's enthusiasm for measurement was a component of his empiricist approach to science, which was quite deliberate and self-conscious. Wherever he could Galton formulated predictions, and put them to the test by taking measurements. Pursuing the idea that the blind are especially discriminating by touch, he proceeded to measure this using blind and sighted subjects, and discovered that the blind are, in fact, usually no more sensitive than the rest. Interested in methods for making tea, he armed himself with notebook and thermometer, and set out on a series of experiments with materials, temperatures, and steeping times, all of which he subjected to taste (his own). Finding a method that produced reliably pleasing results, he pronounced the mystery of the tea pot solved, at least for his own taste. He found space to incorporate his findings into *The Art of Travel*.

Galton used his facility for invention, measurement, and representation to found a research program that remains vital today, some 150 years after he initiated it. Galton's cousin Charles Darwin, whose *Origin of the Species* had a profound influence, sparked the initial inspiration. Darwin's evolutionary theory was based on natural selection. Organisms vary, and evolution proceeds through selection of advantageous variation. Galton considered the human case, which Darwin had barely touched on. It was plain to Galton that people, and races of people, vary a great deal for many important traits, and that certain variations confer a selective advantage. The idea had come to him when he considered gregariousness, a trait that had first interested him when observing the behavior of oxen on his African exploration. Some oxen, he observed, were more gregarious than others, and this might be selectively advantageous as it protected those who expressed it from danger. He detected similar variation among races and individuals, based on his observations of the races he encountered in South-West Africa. He turned from this to consider human ability, which evidently varied greatly. Some initial research suggested this ran strongly in families, and doubtless his own unusually talented forebears sprang to mind. Galton's research program was born in this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

observation, and would be a concerted attempt to place these initial observations, in themselves not remarkable or consequential, on a sound scientific basis.

He had to start from the beginning. First, human traits which varied, had to be identified. Then these traits had to be measured and their distribution determined to establish if they really did differ enough to be of consequence. Then the heritability of those traits had to be established, since only heritable traits would have evolutionary significance. This required an understanding of the nature of heredity, and its mechanism. In the early 1860s, when Galton embarked on this ambitious investigation, little was known about any of these topics. Today a great deal more is known under the field of research called "behavior genetics," with its special application to human ability "differential psychology." Little that preceded Galton's approach has survived.

In the end Galton studied a great many traits, and was led into several productive diversions in the process. The most important psychological trait he studied was ability, summarizing his results in *Hereditary Genius* (1869), then in *English Men of Science* (1874). In essence, by gathering a large sample of eminent men in various fields, he was able to determine that a far greater than expected proportion had eminent relatives, and so he inferred that ability must run in families. *Hereditary Genius* proved to be a tremendously influential work, anticipating the concepts of general intelligence and the use of adoption studies to distinguish the effects of nature and nurture, and introducing the use of statistical grades, now referred to as percentiles. Galton's other varied and innovative psychological investigations were summarized in his *Inquiries into Human Faculty* (1883), and included gregariousness, power of mental visualization, spontaneous word-to-idea association, the operations of the subconscious mind, memory, phobias, color blindness, tendency to see "visions," mental representation of "number forms," and more. He concluded that all these traits varied significantly and were heritable to some extent.

The essential shortcoming Galton had to face was a lack of representative data for any of the traits he considered. He was eventually able to overcome his shortage of hard data by collecting a large body of measurements from the anthropological laboratories he founded in the 1880s, after devising a wide range of measurements, and instruments to match, and persuading the general public to pay three pence each for the privilege of being measured "scientifically." Some 17,000 individuals were measured for various characteristics: strength, weight, height, length and breadth of the head, arm span and lung capacity, visual and auditory reaction time, and perceptions of length. Ultimately this data collection was so successful that the volume of data surpassed the computational and statistical resources available at the time. It was only as recently as 1985 that the surviving data set, still unique of its kind, was fully analyzed using appropriate techniques. The analysis shows that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most of the measurements used were reliable, and that Galton's tests of ability correlated significantly, though weakly, with occupation (which can be used as a rough proxy for ability) [Johnson et al, 1985].

Among the measurements taken by Galton in the anthropological labs were those of fingerprints, which he later investigated for their use in criminology to identify individuals. Fingerprints had previously been proposed as a means of identification, but Galton had been interested initially in determining their hereditary nature. He was aware that their use in criminology would have to overcome fundamental hurdles: it had to be shown that the fingerprint stayed constant through life, that it could reliably be distinguished from the prints of others, and that a practically workable scheme could be put in place for taking and keeping records of prints, and matching them. By examining his large and representative collection of prints, unique in its time, he was able to satisfy all these criteria, devising a classification scheme that was adopted by police internationally, in a modified form. He also concluded, correctly, that fingerprints are to some extent hereditary, and to some extent differ from race to race.

Galton realized that his research program could not be completed without determining the nature of heredity itself. His research in this area proved more fruitful for its by-products than for its concrete results. By conducting blood transfusion experiments on rabbits, he was able to disprove Darwin's theory of pangenesis, which held that the gemmules within bodily fluids transmitted hereditary traits. Galton then conducted experiments on sweet peas, but as with all his investigations into heredity, he chose to study a continuous, rather than a discrete, characteristic: seed size. He would eventually shift his focus to the study of human height. By contrast, Mendel had studied discrete traits, allowing him to formulate his theory of particulate inheritance and genetic dominance. This greatly complicated matters for Galton since, as we now know, he chose complex traits with multiple genetic components, and though he came close to reproducing Mendel's then unknown results, he was not ultimately able to produce a coherent account of heredity capable of surviving the Mendelian revolution, although his work was influential at the time. Rather, the difficulties his traits placed him in forced him to produce some of the most important statistical innovations on the nineteenth century, first in his discovery of regression to the mean, then in his formulation of the correlation coefficient. The Galtonian statistical study of heredity lived on in the form of the biometrical school of Karl Pearson and W.F.R. Weldon (R.A. Fisher was able to show by 1918 that, theoretically, the effects the biometricians studied were describable in Mendelian terms).

Galton had founded his research program on the proposition that individuals and races vary in their expression of many traits, such as ability, and that this variation is subject to natural selection on Darwinian lines. It was obvious to Galton that this selection could be harnessed to improve humans, by

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

encouraging selection of advantageous traits. Indeed, it is hard to argue that less ability is better, or that weaker physical constitutions should be preferred to stronger. He coined the word *eugenics* to describe the process of human improvement he had in mind, an improvement which encompassed not just mental ability but also physical traits such as health, strength, height, and what he called "energy."

Eugenics had been one of Galton's concerns from the very beginning, when he published *Hereditary Genius*. It is not commonly recognized now that he faced a hostile audience from the beginning, and had to make his case patiently and doggedly for many years. After all, if mankind was created in the image of God, how could it be improved? Galton was, above all, afraid of scandalizing public opinion through extremism, and disapproved of the immoderate proposals that H.G Wells and G.B. Shaw brought to the movement. Two kinds of eugenics can now be distinguished: positive and negative. The negative variety operates through punishment and compulsion, usually of the legal kind, sometimes involving measures like sterilization of the unfit. The positive variety seeks instead to promote improvement through rewards, by encouraging those with higher abilities to have more children. Tax breaks and other schemes are what Galton himself had in mind, together with the creation of a *moral* atmosphere which encouraged better breeding, as he would have endorsed. Indeed, eugenics came to be Galton's primary concern later in his life, and he directed all his efforts in the decade before his death to its promotion.

Gillham's account of Galton is well written and fair, more so than one might expect in an age in which publishers are largely hostile to his ideas. Though it breaks little new ground biographically, or even in terms of primary bibliographic sources, it does provide a useful context for some of Galton's interests, especially in its account of the subsequent development of human genetics. It brings to attention some previously neglected aspects of Galton's influence on the statistician F.Y. Edgeworth, who appears to have been written out of the picture by a hostile Karl Pearson. Gillham steers safely away from the sort of psychological speculation about Galton's personal development that he might have indulged in. Refreshingly, he seems to have no political agenda of his own, and does not attempt to evaluate Galton by the standards of "political correctness."

This is a scientific biography by a working scientist. It is divorced from the concerns of postmodernism, and makes no mention of "Victorian hegemony" or "patriarchy." Gillham's book attempts to understand Galton's ideas on their own terms, and for this alone it is praiseworthy. That a major academic publisher has published a substantial biography of Galton twenty-three years after the last biography must surely bring his scientific accomplishments to the notice of a wider audience, who at last has a biography back in print; his cousin Charles Darwin gets one every few months or so.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is nevertheless much that is unsatisfactory about this biography. An overall timid tone pervades it, especially when the author discusses the subject of eugenics. This timid tone does not leave the room, and demands to be noticed. Gillham wastes no time in decrying the application of eugenics by the Nazis. Hopefully this sort of covering fire is not now a pre-requisite for having a book about a figure like Galton published by a major house.

Gillham also places an undue emphasis on the biology of genetics, no doubt due to his own background in this field. Galton is now mostly an historical footnote in that field, interesting as his role may have been at the time. His contributions were rapidly superceded by Mendelian genetics, and working geneticists today do not pay much intellectual homage to Galton. While Gillham's additional material on the history of developments in this field is useful in itself, it dominates rather much of the book, because it is not matched by similar elaboration of the fields that Galton *did* leave a lasting mark on. This leaves Galton looking unjustly reduced in standing, someone who anticipated some ideas, but got most of the details wrong and was soon eclipsed by modern developments. This impression is amplified by Gillham's habitual understatement. For instance, he describes Galton as a "talented scientist," and thinks that his versatility was typically Victorian. A biographer really should be able to distinguish Galton from the masses of merely "talented" scientists—after all, Galton gave us the conceptual apparatus to make distinctions like that. And Galton was certainly not just another versatile Victorian.

The trouble is that Gillham's interest in genetics apparently does not extend to the field of behavior genetics, let alone differential psychology. There is no reference anywhere to a major work in these fields, apart from Herrnstein and Murray's *The Bell Curve* (1994), and that only in passing. Yet Galton is widely acknowledged to be the founder of these disciplines. Behavior genetics pursues essentially the same research program that Galton established. Working scientists in these fields are well aware of their debt to Galton, and frequently acknowledge this in the literature. His influence can be traced directly through the major figures in these fields, from Spearman and Burt to Eysenck and Bouchard.

Where Gillham does touch on topics that behavior genetics has gathered extensive evidence about, he seems to have misunderstood the results. In a brief discussion of twin studies, he asserts that similarities between twins have been exaggerated by selection of anecdotal coincidences! He should give those who work in the field a little more credit. Bouchard (1997) has provided the following summary of IQ studies conducted on identical twins raised apart (the data is simplified for presentation on the next page).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Authors	Sample size	Correlation
Newman et al 1938	19	0.71
Juel-Nielsen 1980	12	0.69
Shields 1962	38	0.75
Bouchard et al 1990	48	0.75
Pedersen, Plomin et al 1992	45	0.78
Weighted Average		**0.75**

At least half the variation in IQ scores in a modern Western population is genetic in origin. However, many studies of IQ heritability include disproportionate numbers of children. Plomin (1997) observes that heritability increases with age, rising to about 0.80 in late adulthood. So Galton's claim that ability is largely inherited is borne out by the modern evidence.

It should be noted that variance in adult ability that is not due to genetic factors is almost entirely due to *non-shared* environment; that is, to factors outside of family experience. This excludes factors which have usually been promoted as environmental influences, such as socioeconomic status, number of books in the home, and so on. It is still unclear exactly what these non-shared influences are, but they must consist of a series of idiosyncratic influences peculiar to each individual, perhaps exposure to minor biological insults and the like, with a cumulative effect. This means that, insofar as the environment has effects, it tends to make people different, and not the same.

With regard to personality there is not as much hard evidence, but Rowe (1994) has provided the following summary of the data available (simplified for presentation here):

Personality Dimension	Heritability
Extraversion	0.49
Agreeableness	0.39
Conscientiousness	0.40
Emotional stability	0.41
Intellectual openness	0.45
Mean	**0.43**

The Minnesota Study of Twins Raised Apart yielded the following data about other variables that would have interested Galton (from Rowe, 1994):

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Measure	Correlation
Fingerprint ridge count	0.97
Height	0.86
Weight	0.73
Systolic blood pressure	0.64
Heart rate	0.49

More data could be presented, but it is enough to note for our purposes that all this data tends to confirm Galton's conclusions to a remarkable degree.

That Gillham is only slightly familiar with differential psychology is shown in his description of Galton's tests of reaction time. As he notes, these tests fell into disfavor when they proved to correlate weakly with themselves and with other tests of ability and achievement. He doesn't seem to be aware that reaction time has now become an important research topic. To make it useful, it must be tested using a series of observations to aggregate the results, thereby eliminating random variation, and overcoming the low item reliability. When Galton's tests were evaluated, a sample of university students was used, greatly restricting the range of variation, and further obscuring the results.

Unfortunately Gillham has missed the opportunity to provide a detailed assessment of Galton's contemporary influence on fields like behavior genetics and differential psychology, and to bring his subject right up to date by presenting the current state of knowledge about the topics that were most important to him. This detracts from the value of what is otherwise a fine biography.

Gavan Tredoux is the editor of ***PINC****, the politically incorrect electronic periodical. He is the author of several articles and book reviews as well as the webmaster of the Upstream internet site and a website devoted to the work and legacy of Francis Galton:* ***http://www.mugu.com/galton/index.html****.*

References

Bouchard Jr., Thomas, "IQ similarity in twins reared apart: Findings and responses to critics." In R. J. Sternberg & E. Grigorenko (ed.), *Intelligence, Heredity, and Environment*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997, pp. 126-162.

Herrnstein, Richard and Charles Murray, *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*, New York: The Free Press, 1994.

Johnson, Ronald C. et al. "Galton's Data a Century Later," *American Psychologist*, August 1985: 40(8), pp. 875-892.

Plomin, Robert and Stephen A. Petrill, "Genetics and Intelligence: What's New?," *Intelligence* 24(1), pp. 53-77.

Rowe, David C. *The Limits of Family Influence*, New York: Guildford Press, 1994.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MACHIAVELLIAN RACIALIST?

James Burnham and the Struggle for the World: A Life

Daniel Kelly
Foreword by Richard Brookhiser
Wilmington, DE: ISI Books, 2002
$29.95
433 pp.

Reviewed by Gil Caldwell

Political and social ideologies seem to have fairly limited life spans. All revolutionary agitations experience a period of great initial fervor and, if successful, come to power. After a time, they age. Having lost their initial passion, they no longer capture the fancy of their own, now institutionalized, elites or that of the masses, whose forever shifting affections follow the cues given by their leaders. Others fail to achieve even this passing success, and the reins of power remain in someone else's hands.

Like these latter movements, the postwar American right lived and died without ever experiencing even the momentary elation of political power. Its national candidates were perennially defeated at the polls. Its practical program, consisting, in its varying incarnations, of the restoration of constitutional government, laissez-faire economics, aggressive pursuit of "victory over Communism," and preservation of the religious, cultural, and racial identity of America never accomplished anything other than an occasional, minuscule slowing down of what *National Review*'s editors once described as the "on-rushing train of history."

However, it is possible that, amidst the ideological remains of that long-since defeated crusade, there may be bits and pieces of wisdom that might prove beneficial to the current, more explicitly racial, defenses of our civilization.

Among all the thinkers of the post-war rightist revival, James Burnham was surely among the most idiosyncratic. He never warmed to many of the movement's public heroes. McCarthy, Goldwater, and Wallace all left him cold. He was a supporter of many aspects of the modern welfare state and saw his colleagues' opposition to it as theoretically errant and tactically wrong.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

His Own Drummer

Religiously, Burnham was a non-believer, and his views on politics were, as he saw them, rooted in a dispassionate, empirical assessment of reality. Following this "realism," he asserted that beneath all political struggles lay neither virtue nor ideals, but rather the drive for power and domination. No matter how persuasive the doctrine or sincere its presenters, Burnham saw, above all, man's desire to rule. Thus, he concluded, all serious efforts to win in the world of politics must be hard-nosed and willing to resort to strategies based on man's deeply flawed nature.

Yet despite the amoralism of his thought, he did seem to have two abiding loyalties. First, he valued some degree of individual liberty because he saw it as the only means to limit the all- consuming drive for power of ruling elites. Second, he valued the West. He wanted it to triumph as it battled its assorted enemies over the years. Thus, he turned his fire first on the communists and later on the Third World masses as well. And, of course, he was always critical of what he saw as our persistent internal enemy, the "ideology of Western suicide," liberalism.

In addition, Burnham never felt pledged, as did many of his colleagues, to pay lip service to the blessings of majority or popular rule. To him the very notion of democracy was a sham. All men live under the direction of elites, he maintained. It was all a question of whose elite was in charge.

The above picture of Burnham emerges quite clearly in Daniel Kelly's *James Burnham and the Struggle for the World: A Life*. The man depicted therein possessed a "somber toned realism, [an] unfailing awareness of the tragic vein running through human life." (p. xvii) He rejected the hopes of utopians as well as the dogmatic doctrines of his *National Review* colleagues.

One is reminded of Woody Allen's observation at the conclusion of *Sleeper*, to the effect that all politics eventually corrupts and all there is to believe in is "sex and death." Burnham might have added "power" to complete the trinity.

Value to Western Resistance

Nothing could be further from the tepid confusion of contemporary "conservatism" than the unblinking defense of the West that James Burnham offered so many decades ago. Yet to Burnham the West was not the Christendom of so many '50s rightists' world view.

If anything seems clear at this point in our history, it is that the traditional Christianity that once proved itself an ally of the West is dead. Indeed, even those tiny remnants of Christians who still mouth the old doctrines have added, in most cases, over the past fifty years, two more planks to their Westminster Confessions and Baltimore Catechisms. These are: first, an endless zeal in praise and promotion of multiracial society; and second, an equally endless fear of Jewish power coupled with promotion of all Jewish agendas.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As early as 1969, Revilo Oliver wrote in *Christianity and the Survival of the West* that the only hope we have as a race is "that the collapse of Christendom, loss of faith in the religion of the West, was a traumatic shock to our racial psyche that stunned but did not kill."

In Burnham we have an example of a profound thinker whose own personal loss of faith (he was raised a Catholic) did not weaken his commitment to race and civilization. The question for racially conscious conservatives today is whether this visceral loyalty to race, emanating from a totally materialist reading of existence, will suffice to inspire the masses of men in an age of self absorption. Is the stoic allegiance of a Burnham sufficient for the general populace?

The further question is whether the realpolitik of Burnham's reading of power can permeate the often romantic mindset of racial counter-revolutionaries. In this sense of the need to view things as they are and to assess rigorously how best to get from "point A" to "point B" without illusions, Burnham also may have much to offer a movement long intent on symbolic, quixotic posturing.

Kelly as Burnham's Conduit?

Kelly's biography of Burnham is fairly thorough. The latter's early years of aesthetic indifference to politics, followed by his embrace of assorted forms of Communism, are described in great detail. Unfortunately the odyssey of Burnham's early rejection of Christianity receives short shrift. Finally, his disenchantment with Trotskyism and the emergence of the new Burnham, cold warrior of the West, is spelled out.

Here the author spends much time detailing *The Managerial Revolution* (1941) and *The Machiavellians* (1943). These two works form the theoretical core of the Burnhamite view on how societies function.

In the former work he posits that the world is being slowly taken over by faceless managers, men of no clear political loyalty or religio-cultural identity. Their goal is simply to rule. What a marvelous picture of the Clintons, Blairs, and Bushes with their European Unionism and New World Order!

In the latter work, Burnham goes a step further. All ideologies are a mask for the drive for power. Seemingly a variation on Freudian sexual reductionism, *The Machiavellians* reduces the realm of politics to the desire to exercise power over others.

In later years, Kelly tells us, Burnham backed off a bit from the sweeping generalizations of *The Machiavellians*. He still considered it his "most important book." However, he saw it as "a little callow." He had given his theoretical mentors "rather more than their due."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When viewed with this disclaimer, the book has much value. All elites do seem to share the same desires and methods to maintain their authority. They are generally ready to compromise, falsify, use force, bully, and do all sorts of nasty things to stay on top.

Thus, politics presents the moral man with the same quandary as "good guy" wrestlers had in the sport's golden years. When does cheating by the opponent allow you to stretch the rules yourself? Presumably, according to Burnham the key is always to remember that one's opponent wants power and will usually have few Marquis of Queensbury constraints on its pursuit.

Burnham's Passion

Besides his sometime mockery of those who didn't realize the "true" nature of politics, Burnham was generally a calm and thoughtful writer and thinker. There was, however, one area where his rhetoric soared—race.

Kelly spends several pages detailing Burham's passion and biting humor on this subject. Whether quoting Burnham's views on the decolonization of Africa, which he saw as "an upsurge of black men against white men" and the latter as "fleeing head long, beaten and panic stricken" or his defense of school segregation and disenfranchisement of southern blacks, Kelly honestly presents the reality of Burnham's thoughts.

He grants that "most people would probably say" that Burnham was "a racist." Yet Kelly rejects this conclusion. He argues that Burnham saw racial differences as the result of history and culture, not genetics. Hence, Kelly argues, Burnham believed that, in the long run, blacks and other Third World peoples could improve to the point where legal equality and self-determination would and should be allowed. In the article "What Is Ahead for Black Africa?" (which Kelly references as the source of his understanding of Burnham's view), we do find the "colonial system" described as a "transition period to civilization." In the same article, though, and left unquoted by Kelly, Burnham describes the current African situation as one in which "the natives are—and, who knows, may perhaps long be—at the stage of primitive, pre-civilized barbarism; quite simply, savagery." This in Kelly's view is still not the dreaded "racism."

In other words, for Kelly, neither the most graphic description of current racial differences nor legalized racial discrimination based upon them is "racism" and therefore presumably remains free of whatever sin he simplistically assumes is attributable to that ideology. Races are allowed to be seen as inferior provided they can change in the future.

This analysis is most extraordinary. It will surely anger the totalitarian multiracialists and their neo-conservative allies who see racialist descriptions and laws in all circumspections as morally repugnant. It might at first glance anger racially conscious conservatives as well. Who wants even so much as

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eventual racial amalgamation? Yet, if genetic racialists are correct, a Burnham-anchored policy that would wait for blacks to work their way towards equality would simply go nowhere.

One has to wonder what Burnham would say today. How would he view the rapidly changing racial demographics of America and the West? Would he regard the threat of the New World Order as being as dangerous as communism? Would he recognize the enormous power and tendency towards social disruption of the international Jewish establishment, and be courageous enough to confront it publicly?

Too Genteel?

There is one disturbing aspect of James Burnham's thought. Its contours became clearer after reading Kelly's book. On the one hand there is the Burnham of *The Machiavellians*, advocating hard-boiled political realism when confronting the great struggles for power of our time. On the other hand there is the Burnham who remained decidedly cool to those rightists of the fifties and sixties who actually excited the public and generated mass support. Neither McCarthy, Goldwater, nor Wallace caught Burnham's fancy.

In the early sixties he was one of the leaders of *National Review*'s condemnation of the John Birch Society, thus effectively breaking in half the movement and allowing the leftist-dominated media to define who was an "extremist."

In fact, Kelly tells us Burnham had a seemingly child-like faith in America. After crossing the nation by car he wrote, "The country shrugs off the fires of the arsonists, the crime of the cities and the riots of the youth as a great ship shrugs off waves."

What allowed Burnham to speak so optimistically of a nation, which, although existing in name, only a few decades later seems drained of the very racial stock and spirit that made it great?

Of all the '50s conservative theorists to emerge from Buckley's *National Review*, Burnham alone was willing to address racial matters with at least some honesty. Of course, there were others with some inclination to racial consciousness, such as E. Merrill Root, Medford Evans, and Revilo P. Oliver, who left the limiting environs of Buckleydom, but of those who stayed only Burnham would so much as mention the white race.

Is there anything to be gained by once again returning to the thought of James Burnham today? Communism as a viable force is gone. The vague phrase of "managerial elites" seems tepid, almost meaningless, in an era of massive social decadence, the self-loathing of white elites, and Jewish power.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Empiricism

In the end, Burnham's uniqueness as a non-religious and racially conscious thinker may be his lasting legacy to attempts at Western revival. To Burnham morality was a human construct. So too were the myths by which man and nations constitute themselves.

Despite these assumptions, Burnham remained a man of the West. He bemoaned its weakness. He summoned it to battle. He despised the "savages" before whom it was humbled.

Why? Neither God or gods were his ultimate source. It lay somehow within: A desire to see one's own kind survive and prosper. Of course, Burnham seemed to believe that should the "savages" become "civilized" then we could allow ourselves to mingle with them.

Ignoring Burnham's particular blindness, the larger question is whether any people can endure when stripped of the tales of a deity or deities that have motivated men from the beginning of time. Are we of the West crippled in our encounters with more primitive peoples by our very rationality that today renders all gods suspect in our eyes?

Further, was this very arid empiricism that served as the bedrock of Burnham's thought precisely the cause of his failure to embrace passionate mass movements dedicated to some form of a major change in the American system? Does racial consciousness need faith? A reflection on Burnhamism may be helpful in arriving at answers.

Morality

In addition, one of the core issues which fascinates and divides racialists is that of group versus universal morality. One of the great strengths of pre-modern peoples—of which it seems the Jews are still an example—is the vast gulf between morality for one's own group, seen as just and compassionate, and that for the out-group, which is viewed as less than human, worthy of exploitation and conquest.

Surely many of the racial ideologies of the postwar era that have sought to work together with nationalists of all races and faiths were deeply influenced by universal morality. One may not deprive any other people of that which we ourselves demand and desire. Others have maintained the more Darwinian/imperialist view that life is a struggle between species (nations, classes, races). During the pre-World War II period most racially conscious people accepted the tribal-centered view. Does one owe any moral considerations to those outside the group? Must morality be reciprocal? How should Western man wage war against those who do not have his higher moral vision?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In all probability Burnham would not have been much burdened by these scruples. As a realist he would have counseled that the world is an often brutal place and those who are to survive must be willing for the sake of their own kinfolk frequently to behave with toughness.

In fact, white racially conscious movements are today split between those who believe that even in the midst of a life and death struggle we must always behave like Christian or, at least Western, gentlemen and those who would like to see a bit more of the tribal rage of Europe's pagan ancestors.

Burnham did not explore these questions in any great depth in his writings. Nonetheless, by being who he was, he set an example for those who followed alternative models and philosophies for white survival. Indeed, the mere fact that he thought in racial terms and took the "suicide of the West" seriously sets him apart from most of his *National Review* contemporaries.

Mr. Kelly's book is a fine introduction to Burnham's life and thought. It is worth reading first because Burnham's Machiavellianism has much to offer students of any socio-political setting, and secondly, because his secular, non-universalist thinking will be of value to many racially conscious rightists when preparing for the battles of the future.

James Burnham was a quiet man who carried his learning and intelligence with much dignity. Yet, his voice may well still be heard even after those of the vast majority of his contemporaries have long since faded into oblivion.

Gil Caldwell is a East Coast academic and occasional freelance writer.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Middle America's Political Revolt

The New White Nationalism in America:
Its Challenge to Integration

Carol M. Swain
New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002
$30.00 US

527 pp.

Reviewed by Robert S. Griffin

Carol Swain, the author of *The New White Nationalism in America*, is an academic, a professor of political science and law at Vanderbilt University. The publisher of this book, Cambridge University Press, is an academic publisher. That might well lead one to assume that this volume provides a detached, objective, and even-handed treatment of this topic. But not so fast. A sentence on the last page is an indication of what awaits the reader: "By now I hope the readers of this book are convinced of the need to take white nationalism and the other challenges to American society highlighted in these pages as seriously as they would a diagnosis of cancer."

One might also assume from her credentials—Vanderbilt, and an earlier book of hers, *Black Faces, Black Interests*, which won prizes—and Cambridge University Press's solid reputation that this author brings a wide range of experience with white nationalism and a deep understanding of it to this writing. Again, not so fast. Take into account that there is no evidence in this book that Professor Swain has ever spoken to, corresponded with, or been in the presence of a white nationalist. The only personal contact reported in the book is her encounter with "a middle-aged cab driver of Jewish-Irish descent whom I will call Jerry."

She asks Jerry, "What do you think the future holds for American race relations?" While she takes "copious notes," Jerry the cab driver tells her he thinks there is going to be a race war, recounts a dream in which he is taken captive by some blacks and escapes, and admits occasionally to reading white supremacy literature. As for how much Dr. Swain has learned about white nationalism from secondary sources, it appears that she has read a few things

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and scanned the Internet a bit. I am reminded of my mother referring to something so little "you could put it in your eye." It would be an overstatement to say that Swain's level of understanding of white nationalism meets that standard, but it doesn't miss it by much.

In the preface Swain informs the reader that she has written this book "especially for people who consider themselves to be liberals on public policy issues," and then goes on to say that "by liberals I refer to individuals who favor vigorous governmental intervention to ensure the advancement of racial and ethnic minorities and to protect them from official and private discrimination."

The fact is the title of this book is a misnomer. This book isn't really about the new white nationalism; for that matter, it isn't even about the advancement of minority groups, plural. It is about furthering the agenda of the group to which Swain herself belongs, native-born black Americans. There is no evidence in this writing that Swain has the least concern for Asians or Hispanics or any other minority group. For instance, she makes it clear she thinks that racial preference policies should lump Hispanics together with whites, and that immigrants—ninety percent of whom are minorities in recent years—should not be eligible at all.

Essentially, and quite remarkably, *The New White Nationalism* is about affirmative action for African Americans. Huge chunks of the book are devoted to the topic. By my count, seven of the book's fifteen chapters make no pretense of including a treatment of white nationalism. Really, they could have been written for another book, and frankly, I suspect they were. For instance, there's the chapter, "Affirmative Action Past and Present," which goes into great detail about the history of affirmative action, the 1964 Civil Rights Act and all the rest and offers the conclusion that "many forms of affirmative action... are destructive to peaceful and productive race relations in America and are not needed to combat the very real discrimination that racial minorities often encounter."

Swain goes on to say that these policies and programs have outlived their usefulness to blacks because they "they threaten to undermine public support for those principles of racial integration and racial justice that so inspired the nation during the civil rights era of the 1950s and 1960s." In other words, whites are catching on to them. Swain believes that replacing race preferences with what she calls, with perhaps a Marxist overtone, "class-based preferences," ones that "take into account the obstacles an individual has had to overcome in his life," will keep blacks at the head of the line and at the same time mute hostility from whites, who will be less likely to see this arrangement as grossly unfair.

There is no evidence in this book that Swain cares a whit about the status or well-being of white people. There is every indication that she wants whites exactly where they have been for decades: splintered and deferential to blacks. The very thought of white racial consciousness and solidarity gives her the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shivers. She worries about multiculturalism in this regard: "minority defenders of multiculturalism, in making their case for racial, ethnic, and cultural minorities to organize and celebrate group pride and self-determination, have unwittingly laid the foundation for a corresponding white-centered racial movement that celebrates the racial pride of white people."

On college campuses, she notes, multiculturalism has had the "desired effect of sensitizing white students to minority concerns," but it has also had an unintended and unanticipated consequence: white students have been prompted to establish parallel white organizations that "seek recognition as genuine cultural contributions to university life." And we certainly can't have that. Why not? "Any trend toward the establishment of white student organizations could imperil traditional racial and ethnic studies programs by decreasing the limited resources available to these groups and exacerbating ethnic rivalries and tensions." Read, whites won't roll over and play dead anymore.

And where does white nationalism fit in all of this? It's a big threat to Swain's action. White nationalism, she writes,

> has the potential for considerable expansion beyond its present scope and threatens to disrupt the fragile racial situation in America and elsewhere.... Contemporary white nationalists draw upon the potent rhetoric of national self-determination and national self-assertion in an attempt to protect what they believe is their God-given natural right to their distinct cultural, political, and genetic identity as white Europeans. This identity, they believe, is gravely threatened in contemporary America by the rise of multiculturalism, affirmative action policies that favor minorities, large-scale immigration into the United States from non-white nations, racial intermarriage, and the identity politics pursued by rival racial and ethnic groups.

The very thought of that keeps Swain up nights. And what makes white nationalism a particularly strong threat to the racial status quo—one in which Swain's people are ears-deep slopping at the trough—is that the "polish and sophistication" of the current white nationalist leaders and organizations are enabling them to get the white nationalist message across very effectively. Bad news to Swain.

Interspersed throughout the book are transcripts of phone interviews with white nationalist figures conducted by Princeton instructor Russell Nieli. Among those Nieli interviewed were Jared Taylor, the editor of *American Renaissance* magazine; Michael Levin, professor of philosophy at City University of New York; David Duke, who heads the European Unity and Rights Organization; Don Black, the founder of the Stormfront web site; William Pierce, the chairman of the National Alliance; and Matt Hale and Lisa Turner from the World Church of the Creator. Swain concedes that these individuals are more intelligent and sophisticated than most Americans realize, which makes them, in her eyes, "more dangerous." Actually, the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interview transcripts are the best part of the book. The interviewees are articulate, and taken together their comments outline the basic tenets of white nationalism quite well. Swain promises that a forthcoming book edited by Dr. Nieli and herself, *White Pride, White Protest: Contemporary Voices of White Nationalism*, will present the interviews in their entirety. That would seem a book to check out—don't pay money for this one.

So what does Swain do with the interview transcripts? For all practical purposes, nothing. She doesn't work with the substance of what the white nationalists say. Either she goes forward as if their statements never existed, or the individuals or their organizations or both (not what they say) are incorporated into what she spends her time doing in this book: talking about herself—she is a GED high school graduate, ex-welfare recipient, and born-again Christian quoting and summarizing writers who support her stance, reporting the comments of organizations and individuals antagonistic to white nationalism, name-calling, and pontificating.

I find this ironic because a theme of the book, repeated time and again, is the need for interracial dialogue. Swain demonstrates little or no desire to deal with the particulars of what these white nationalists say, and she seems incapable of empathizing with anyone's frame of reference or needs other than her own.

A David Duke transcript has him saying that his organization "is about the preservation of our [European-American] entity as an ethnic people, our existence, our values, our culture, our traditions, and the things that really go to make up traditional America." Swain doesn't relate to that. Preservation of the European-American entity? What does that have to do with black people and racial integration and her version of racial harmony? She ignores Duke's comment and says that Duke's group "seems to flirt with some vaguely defined ideal of racial separation . . . ."

In another transcript, Jared Taylor is quoted to the effect that powerful forces are destroying European man and European civilization on the American continent. "If we do nothing, the nation we leave our grandchildren will be a grim Third World failure, in which whites will be in a minority [and Western Civilization, if it exists at all,] will be a faint echo." Swain doesn't bother responding to that. Instead, she points out that many white nationalist groups have "innocuous-sounding" names and lists Taylor's New Century Foundation as an example. That sets up her comment that "casual listeners are unlikely to be alarmed or tipped off about a friend or colleague's affiliation with such groups since their names raise no red flags." But what really bothers Swain about Taylor is that his organization has a sizeable Jewish membership. Three guesses why that puts her off. Jews have tended to be supporters of blacks. "[I]t is most troubling when I see groups like Taylor's finding Jewish

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recruits, leaving African Americans more isolated than ever before." It is important to remember that the Swain book is not about how you are; it is about how she is.

William Pierce, in one of the transcripts, asserts that the membership of his organization, the National Alliance, has seven times the percentage of academics as does the general population. Matt Hale states that the Church of the Creator does not welcome people who are irresponsible, and that college students are the bulwarks of his organization. Rather than confront any of the implications of these claims, Swain is content to fall back, in the book's conclusion, on a fifty-year-old quote from longshoreman philosopher Eric Hoffer about "failures, misfits, outcasts, criminals, and all those who have lost their footing, or never had one" and how these "inferior elements of a nation can exert a marked influence on its course [because] they are wholly without reverence for the present." Swain pronounces that "[t]he truth of that statement is evident in the styles and leadership of contemporary white nationalist groups." Case closed.

Swain gets a lot of mileage out of quotes from individuals representing the so-called "watchdog agencies"—the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the Simon Wiesenthal Center, and the Southern Poverty Law Center—to the effect that white nationalists and their organizations are a menace to decent people everywhere.

"The Internet... permits bigots to communicate easily and anonymously, cheaply raise money for their activities, and threaten and intimidate their enemies." "Colleges and universities are experiencing hate, racism, and homophobia." "The World Church of the Creator is a religion for sociopaths." And so on.

Yet, early in the book Swain quotes two writers as saying that the ADL and the others are "intensely hostile to the people and organizations they monitor and have a tendency to portray them in the worst possible light." The goal of these organizations, say these writers, "is to have the public regard the racist and anti-Semitic right with the same affection they would the AIDS epidemic or the outbreak of ebola fever." That doesn't stop Swain from referring to one of these groups as a "public interest organization," to another as an "organization that monitors hate groups" and reporting their broadsides against white nationalists and their organizations as if they come from an unbiased source. One wonders whether Swain can remember what she wrote and if she is capable of grasping contradictions in her presentation; or if she actually wrote everything that is in the book.

Swain ends *The New White Nationalism in America* with a series of recommendations, both general and directed specifically at black leaders. A number of the general ones reiterate what she advocates throughout the book: replacing race-based with class-based affirmative action, open discourse and candid dialogue, and directly confronting the issues of black people.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Her general recommendations also include the following (keep in mind this is a book about the new white nationalism in America):

- Ensure that all public school districts offer vocational training. "What I found in each city [I lived in] was the all-too-familiar tracking of African-American students into low-level courses and a lack of vocational education for those minority youth who are not suited for college. My oldest son struggled through high school and although it was clear that college was not a realistic option for him, he never had the opportunity to learn a marketable skill...."
- Invest public dollars such that all who seek to attend a community college are able to. "I found my own educational options quite limited, so I chose to attend a community college."
- Establish financial partnerships between car dealers and government agencies to allow the working poor to tap into car loans and grants for automobiles. "Until I financed an automobile for a niece of mine, she regularly paid $12 a day in taxicab fares for transportation to her job at Kentucky Fried Chicken."
- Establish humane child support guidelines. "Several of my brothers have had children out of wedlock by different partners... One brother had child support payments for five illegitimate children... which left him with take-home pay of less than $25 a week."

The recommendations directed at black leaders include appeals to reduce black crime, rioting, illegitimacy, and AIDS, and to drop their call for reparations (because it alienates potential allies).

What can one take away from reading *The New White Nationalism in America?* More than anything, the reader will be left with the sober realization of who gets on the faculty at Vanderbilt University and who gets published by Cambridge University Press.

Robert S. Griffin is a professor of education at the University of Vermont and the author of the book, ***The Fame of a Dead Man's Deeds: An Up-Close Portrait of White Nationalist William Pierce****.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

About the Editors

- **Editor**

Kevin Lamb, a Hoosier native and graduate of Indiana University, with undergraduate degrees in political science and journalism, is a conservative freelance writer who has published in several periodicals, including *National Review*, *Chronicles*, *The Asian Wall Street Journal*, *Society*, *Mankind Quarterly*, *Conservative Review*, *The Journal of Social, Political & Economic Studies*, and is a frequent contributor to *The Social Contract* and *Right Now*. A former intern of the National Journalism Center (Washington, DC), and former Marine reservist, Mr. Lamb resides with his family near Washington, DC, where he works as a librarian and research assistant.

- **Associate Editor & Book Editor**

Samuel Francis, Ph.D., is a graduate of Johns Hopkins University (BA, 69) and the University of North Carolina, (MA, 71; PhD 79), and former policy analyst with the Heritage Foundation as well as a former U.S. Senate staff member. Formerly an award-winning staff columnist with *The Washington Times*, where he served as editorial writer, 1986-91, deputy editorial page editor, 1987-91, Dr. Francis writes a nationally syndicated column, is a contributing editor to *Chronicles*, where he writes a monthly column "Principalities and Powers," and is currently Editor-in-Chief of the *Citizens Informer*. He is the author of *The Soviet Strategy of Terror*, Heritage Foundation, 1981; *Power and History: The Political Thought of James Burnham*, University Press of America, 1983; *Beautiful Losers: Essays on the Failure of American Conservatism*, University of Missouri Press, 1993; and *Revolution from the Middle*, Middle American Press, 1996. His writings have appeared in major newspapers and magazines, including *The New York Times*, *USA Today*, *National Review*, *The Spectator* (London). Dr. Francis also serves on the Board of Editorial Advisors for *Modern Age: A Quarterly Review*.

- **Web Edition Editor**

Louis Andrews is a graduate of the College of Charleston (BS, 66) and did graduate work in the Department of History at the University of South Carolina. He is a businessman, web developer, and writer and has been published in *Right Now!*, the *Augusta Chronicle*, and the online journal *pinc* for which he served as book review editor. He is also the developer and web-master of the Stalking the Wild Taboo website. Though a native of South Carolina, Mr. Andrews has lived in Augusta, GA since 1982.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Editorial Advisory Board

Virginia Abernethy, Ph.D., emeritus professor of psychiatry Vanderbilt University Medical School, is the author of *Population Politics: The Choices that Shape Our Future* (Insight Books, 1993; Transaction 1999), *Population Pressure and Cultural Adjustment* (Human Sciences Press, 1979) and (editor) *Frontiers in Medical Ethics: Applications in a Medical Setting* (Ballinger, 1980). A former editor of *Population and Environment*, she is the author of numerous articles in professional journals and member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. She is a graduate of Wellesley College (B.A., 1955) and Harvard University (M.A. 1969, Ph.D., 1970).

Frank Ellis, Ph.D., is Lecturer in Russian at the University of Leeds, England and is the author of *Vasily Grossman: The Genesis and Evolution of a Russian Heretic* (Berg, 1994), *From Glasnost to the Internet: Russia's New Infosphere* (St. Martin's Press, 1999), and *The Macpherson Report: 'Anti-racist' Hysteria and Sovietization of the United Kingdom* (Right Now Press Ltd, 2001). He has published articles on topics that range from Soviet war literature to political correctness. Prior to taking up an academic career he was a professional soldier and served in the Parachute Regiment of the Special Air Service.

Joseph E. Fallon, author of *Deconstructing America: Immigration, Nationality and Statehood* and a co-editor of the seven-volume history *German-Americans in the World Wars*, is a freelance writer/researcher. He began his Masters Degree program at the American University of Cairo, Egypt and obtained his Masters in International Affairs from Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs.

Wayne Lutton, Ph.D., editor of *The Social Contract*, is a policy analyst and historian. He has published widely on population and immigration concerns. With a Ph.D. in history, Dr. Lutton has been research director for an educational institute and a college professor. He is the author or contributor to many books and monographs including *The Immigration Time Bomb* (revised 1988), and *The Immigration Invasion*. His articles and reviews have appeared in *Chronicles*, *National Review*, *The Social Contract* and other journals of scholarship and opinion.

Richard Lynn, Ph.D., professor emeritus of psychology, University of Ulster, Coleraine, Londonderry, Northern Ireland, is the author most recently of *Eugenics: A Reassessment* (Praeger, 2001), *The Science of Human Diversity: A History of the Pioneer Fund* (University Press of America, 2001), and *Dysgenics: Genetic Deterioration in Modern Populations* (Praeger, 1996). Other published writings include: "National IQ and Economic Development: A Study of Eighty-One Developing Nations," (with Tatu Vanhanen) *Mankind Quarterly* (Summer 2001), "Geographical Variation in Intelligence," in *The Scientific Study of Human Nature: Tribute to Hans J. Eysenck at Eighty*, (editor) Helmuth Nyborg (Pergamon, 1997), "The Decline of Genotypic Intelligence," and "In Support of the Nutrition Theory," in *The Rising Curve: Long-Term Gains in IQ and Related Measures*, (editor) Ulric Neisser (APA, 1998). A contributor to various monographs and psychological journals, Dr. Lynn's previous books include: *Educational Achievement in Japan: Lessons for the West* (M.E. Sharpe, 1988), (editor) *Dimensions of Personality: Papers in Honour of H.J. Eysenck* (Pergamon, 1981) and *Personality and National Character* (Pergamon, 1971). He currently serves as an editorial advisor to *Mankind Quarterly*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kevin MacDonald, Ph.D., professor of psychology, California State University-Long Beach, is the editor of *Population and Environment* and former editor of the *Human Behavior and Evolution Society Newsletter*. He is the author most recently of *The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements* (Praeger, 1998), *Separation and Its Discontents: Toward an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism* (Praeger, 1998), and *A People that Shall Dwell Alone: Judaism as a Group Evolutionary Strategy* (Praeger, 1994). As a frequent contributor to monographs and author of numerous articles in evolutionary psychology, religion and ethnic relations, his previous books include: *Sociobiological Perspectives on Human Development* (Springer-Verlag, 1988), *Social and Personality Development: An Evolutionary Synthesis* (Plenum, 1988) and (editor) *Parent-Child Play: Descriptions and Implications* (State University of New York Press, 1993).

Brent A. Nelson, Ph.D., a freelance writer, is the author of *America Balkanized - Immigration's Challenge to Government* (American Immigration Control Foundation 1994) as well as numerous articles and book reviews.

James C. Russell, Ph.D., is the author of *The Germanization of Early Medieval Christianity: A Sociohistorical Approach to Religious Transformation* (Oxford University Press, 1994) and has taught classes at Saint Peter's College, New Jersey.

Jared Taylor, editor of *American Renaissance* and president of the New Century Foundation, is a graduate of Yale and of the Paris Institute of Political Studies. He is the author or editor of several books, most recently, *The Real American Dilemma: Race, Immigration, and the Future of America* (New Century Books, 1998) and *Paved With Good Intentions: The Failure of Race Relations in Contemporary America* (Carroll & Graf, 1992).

Derek Turner, editor of the London-based conservative quarterly *Right Now!*, is a British journalist and frequent contributor to *Chronicles* and *The Social Contract*.

Miles D. Wolpin, Ph.D., J.D., is professor emeritus of political science, State University of New York, Potsdam, (NY) and the author of a dozen books, including *Alternative security and military dissent* (Austin & Winfield, 1994) and *America insecure: arms transfers, global interventionism, and the erosion of national security* (McFarland & Co., 1991) as well as scores of articles on militarism, national security, Third World politics, and immigration. He is a frequent contributor to *The Social Contract*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED